THE CYPRIANICK-BISHOP

Examined, and Found not to be a

DIOCESAN,

Nor to have *Superior Power* to
A Parish Minister, *or* PRESBYTERIAN MODERATOR:

Being an *ANSWER* to *J. S.* his
Principles of the CYPRIANICK-AGE,
With Regard to Episcopal Power & Jurisdiction.

TOGETHER WITH

An APPENDIX,

In ANSWER to a Railing *Preface* to a BOOK, Entituled,
The Fundamental Charter of PRESBYTERY.

By *GILBERT RULE*, one of the Ministers of the City, and Principal of the Colledge, of *Edinburgh*.

EDINBURGH,
Printed by the Heirs and Successors of *Andrew Anderson*,
Printer to His most Excellent Majesty, *Anno Dom.* 1696.

Edr. May 6. 1696. ☿. 18d.

THE PREFACE.

OF *this Controverſie about Epiſcopacy, the Learned* Vitringa, de Synagog. vet. lib. 2. C. 2. P. 474. *hath this Obſervation*; à quo tempore Eccleſia Reformati nominis, ſeceſſionem fecit à Pontificia Romana, & diverſam recepit regiminis formam, tantopere præferbuit litibus, de vero typo Regiminis Eccleſiæ, ut nulla controverſia fere eruditorum calamos tam diu, tam ſeriò, & pertinaciter, & tanto utrinque ſtudio & contentione, & vincendi tam ſpe, quam deſiderio, exercuerit, atque hæc ipſa. *It alſo hath long divided the Church in theſe Nations, and ſeemeth, in our days, to be further from Accommodation, than ever*: Presbyterians, *on the one Hand, growing daily more and more clear, and confident, that Parity is of Divine Inſtitution, and cannot lawfully be changed, tho' mean while, they have Charity to good Men who are otherwiſe minded: and ſome of our Epiſcopal Brethren, on the other ſide, beginning to talk higher for a* Jus Divinum *to be for* Prelacy, *than their Predeceſſors did: and counting all the Societies of Chriſtians which are without Biſhops, to be no Churches of Chriſt, but a Company of* damnable Schiſmaticks; *among whom there can be no Salvation: if theſe men be for* Peace, *let any judge. But it is unaccountable, that in a Matter that Salvation does ſo much depend upon, in their Opinion, they ſhould lay ſo much ſtreſs (as they commonly do) on the Opinions of Men, and the Teſtimonies of the antient Church: ſeing,* 1 *All, except* Papiſts, *agree, that Matters of Faith, and which Salvation dependeth on, muſt be determined only by Scripture: and that God ſpeaking in his Word, is*

the only Judge in ſuch Controverſies. Secondly, *The Fathers themſelves plead for this, and diſown both each himſelf, and one another as either Judge, or ſufficient Witneſs in ſuch Debates*: Optat. Milevit. contra Parmen. lib. 5. de Cœlo quærendus eſt judex, ſed ut quid pulſamus ad Cœlum cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Teſtamentum. Jerom *in a Debate with* Auguſt. *had cited ſeven Fathers for his Opinion, and craved leave to err, (if he did err) with ſo many Learned Doctors, to whom* Auguſtine *replyed*, ipſe mihi pro his omnibus, imò ſupra hos omnes, Apoſtolus Paulus occurit, ad ipſum confugio, ad ipſum omnes qui aliud ſentiunt provoco, *&c. Auguſtin. Hieron. Ep.* 19. the ſame *Auguſt. Ep.* 3. Fortunatiano. Neque enim (*ſaith he*) quorumlibet diſputationes quamvis Catholicorum,& laudatorum hominum velut Scripturas Canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat ſalva honorificentia, quæ illis debetur, aliquid contra *&c. and Tom.* 2. *Ep.*112.Paulinæ: nunquid ullo modo Evangelio nos comparabis, aut ſcripta noſtra (*he ſpeaketh of himſelf and* Ambroſe) Scripturis Canonicis coæquabis? Profecto ſi recte in judicando ſapis, longe nos infra vides ab illa authoritate diſtare. *Yea, in particular, this mark of Inſufficiency to prove a Divine Truth, is ſet on* Cyprian's *Authority, by* Auguſtine, l. 2. *contra* Creſcon. *cap.*32. Hujus Epiſtolæ authoritate ego non teneor; quia literas *Cypriani* non ut Canonicas habeo. Et ibid. *c.*31. Nos nullam *Cypriano* facimus injuriam, cum ejus quaſlibet literas à Canononica divinarum literarum authoritate diſtinguimus. Thirdly, *It is obſervable, that even the* Affrican *Fathers, after* Cyprian, *do not ſpeak ſo high of Epiſcopal Prælation, as* Cyprian *doth; as* Auguſtine, *Cited in the Book it ſelf, his* ſecundum honorum vocabula, *and* uſus obtinuit; *are two conſiderable Diminutives, and derogate the one from the Degree of Epiſcopal Authority, the other from the Perpetuity and Divine Right of it. And* Primaſius Uticenſis *calleth the Presbyterate*, ſecundus, & penè unus Gradus cum Epiſcopatu; ſicut multis Scripturarum Teſtimoniis comprobatur. In Tim. 1. C. 3. *Now theſe two* Affrican *Biſhpos could not but know* Cyprian's *mind, and therefore they either differed from him in this*

Matter

Matter, or (which I rather think,) Cyprian *used higher, and more keen Expressions, for the same things, and that out of a peculiar Zeal, that he had for the Dignity of the Church; and to magnifie his Office.* Fourthly, *It is evident that the Antient Bishops, and other Divines, when they gave Marks of the True Church, brought them always from the Scripture, not from Humane Testimony.* August. Ep. 50. Bonifacio Comiti: in Sanctis Libris ubi manifestatur Dominus Christus, ibi & ejus Ecclesia declaratur: *Where also he Chargeth them with Wonderful Blindness, who seek Christ in the Scripture, and the Church in Humane Writings. Also* Cyprian. Ep. Cœcilio; *and in that to* Pompeius, *proveth that we must follow Christ and his written Word only, as our Rule, and not old Customs and Practices. The same thing* Gerson *proveth, in a Sermon before the* Pope, *and asserteth that the Scripture is sufficient for the Government of the Church: and calleth it Blasphemy to say, that it can be better done by mens Inventions.* Fifthly, *The Antient Bishops (even such of them as were Holy and Humble,) might have too high Thoughts of their own Prælation, and too much Inclination to greaten it. That Temper appeared among the Apostles, while Christ was with them. Great Corruptions in the Church have Insensibly had their Beginning from Good and Zealous Men.* Sixthly, *Many Famous and Learned Bishops, much later than these called Fathers, and yet before the Reformation from* Popery, *held that Bishops and Presbyters were by Divine Institution every way one, so* Anselm *Arch-Bishop of* Canterbury *on* Philip. 1. *and* Tit. 1. Rich. Armachan. in quæst. Armenorum: Æneas Sylvius, (*afterward* Pope Pius secundus) Ep. 130; *which is concerning his Conference with the Ministers of the* Taborites. *Also in the time of the Reformation, the* English *Bishops and Clergy, who still were* Popish, *in the Book called* the Institution of a Christian Man; Chap. of the Sacrament of Orders. Cassander *in his* Consultation Art. 14. *saith,* non convenit inter Theologos, & Canonistas, an Episcopatus ponendus inter Ordines Ecclesiasticos: convenit autem inter omnes, Apostolorum Ætate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nullum Discrimen, *&c.*

Seventhly,

Seventhly, *Even Mr.* Dodwell (*as high as he is for Epiſcopal Authority,*) *ſaith, that* the firſt Biſhops were made by Presbyters: and that it behoved to be ſo, otherwiſe the Succeſſion could not be ſecured in the firſt times of Perſecution. *How this conſiſteth either with our Author's Book, or with his own, againſt* Separation from the Epiſcopal Chairs, *let the Reader judge. It's true, Mr.* Dodwell (*it is* 521, 522.) *pretendeth* not to be afraid of the Conſequence of this Aſſertion, with Reſpect to the Biſhop's abſolute Power, becauſe Kings alſo are Inveſted by their Subjects, (*this Paralell I might, but ſhall not Debate with him,*) *but how can he, on this Suppoſition, defend their ſole Power of Ordination to be of Divine Right; I cannot ſee, but ſhall be glad to be inſtructed. I inſiſt not on the Suſpicion, that* Cyprian's *Epiſtles are corrupted;* tho' Auguſtine Ep. 48. Vincentio; *hath theſe words,* neque enim potuit integritas atque notitia literarum unius quantumlibet illuſtris Epiſcopi, (*Cyprian* ſcil.) cuſtodiri quemadmodum Scriptura Canonica, &c. *What is ſaid, may derogate much from the Teſtimonies that my Antagoniſt bringeth, and warrant our putting a ſenſe on them, different from the ſound they have in the Ears of this Author, and ſome others of his Perſwaſion. The Reader may know, that our Debate is not about the* Jus, *but* Factum; *not how the Church ſhould be Governed, but how it was done in the Age mentioned. In which, I affirm that tho' it is manifeſt, that the Biſhop was above the Presbyter in Dignity and Order, yet he did not Rule the Church by himſelf, but the Presbyters had equal Power with him in managing Church-Government.*

THE

THE Cyprianick-Biſhop Examined, &c.

SOME of the Epiſcopal Clergy of *Scotland*, who have loſt their places, wherein they ſat ſilent, without troubling the Presbyterians with their Controverſal Writings (for they then dealt with them by other Weapons) are now at leaſure to maintain the Stickle that way: and ſome are ſo irritated by their Loſſes, that much more of their paſſionat Reſentment, and perſonal Reflections againſt ſuch as never did them wrong, appeareth in their Books, than Strength of Arguments for what they hold in our preſent Debates; I have with much wearineſs and Reluctancy conſidered ſome of theſe Pieces: and hoped our Debates had been at an end, after their ſilence for ſome time, and that we ſhould no more be that way diverted from our more neceſſary Work: till I lately met with a Treatiſe called the *Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, &c. which I find to be written in a more Schollar like and leſs unchriſtian Strain, than what I have hitherto ſeen from theſe men. He dealeth fairly by Arguments, tho I am not terrified nor convinced by the Strength of them, and I am reſolved to treat him with the ſame Civility, and for the weight of my reaſonings, let the Reader judge. It is not Victory, but the clearing and maintaining of Truth, that I deſign; and ſhall not be aſhamed to become his Proſelyte, if what I hold be found to be an Error.

§. 2. Before I consider his Book in the particular Contents of it, I shall make a few general Remarks about it. 1. Then, if we should grant all that he pleadeth for, it would not ruine the Cause of Presbyterians, nor establish Prelacy: It would amount to no more but this, that one Presbyterian, and he among the meanest of them, did mistake in matter of Fact, as it is related in the Antient History. He might know, that neither the Presbyterians generally, nor that Author in particular, did ever lay the Stress of their Cause on the Practice or Principles of the Church, after the Apostolick Age: Tho' we will not yield the Suffrage of later Antiquity to be for our Adversaries: yet that is the Antiquity that we build upon; for it is Divine, not humane Authority that we take for the Rule of our Belief and Practice, in the matter of Church-Government, and managing the Affairs of the House of GOD. *Timothy* was to be guided by it, 1 *Tim.* 3 14, 15. and so will we. And even the *Defender* of the *Vindication* against the *Apologist*, or *his Friend*, (as our Author calleth him, P. 4.) hath fully declared his Opinion to this purpose; *Rational Defence of Non-conformity*, P. 158. which Book our Author seemeth to be no stranger to; for he is (*P.* 69) at pains to cite and try his critical Skill upon a Passage in it. He could not then, think to silence Presbyterians by this his Attempt: we have other Grounds, if we were beaten from this, as I hope we shall not. If his Book was written only to convince the World, that he who wrote the *Defence* of the *Vindication* against the *Apologist*, is not infallible in all that he asserteth; he might have spared his pains: that should easily have been yielded to him. To write a Book of Twelve Sheets on such a Subject, is such Work as we have no time for. *Egregiam verò laudem, & spolia ampla* —— He had read *Cyprian's Epistles* (which are not very voluminous) and had made a Collection of Citations; and thus they must have a vent.

§. 3. The Passage that he buildeth his whole Fabrick upon, was by the *Defender* (which is my second Remark) set down with that Brevity that was suitable to the purpose in hand; tho' may be not sufficient to preclude all the critical Notes that a Man of this Author's

thor's Skill and Learning could make, when he is so disposed to do. The *Apologist* had, in a rambling and incoherent way, started a Number of Debates that are between us and the Prelatists, insisting on none of them: And the *Defender* thought not fit to make a large Treatise on each of these Heads, but answered what he proposed, with a suitable succinctness; If he had then thought it convenient, or had imagined that so large a Book as our Author's, would have been built on this Passage, he would have made the Foundation broader, tho' not more commodious for what this Author buildeth on it: He could have told him, that tho' he might be bold to venture his Credit on the *Cyprianick Age*, being more on our side than on that of our Adversaries; And tho' our Cause, duely and distinctly stated, should suffer no loss by being tryed at that Barr, yet neither did he venture any bodies Reputation but his own, nor will he quit the more divine *Letters Patents* that we have for Presbytrey, to rest in this, either as our only, or our chief Strength. Notwithstanding of what I have now remarked concerning this Author snatching at a fancied Advantage against us, I hope to make it evidently appear that he hath wholly missed his Aim, and that these two or three Lines of my Book will stand against the shock of his long Treatise.

§. 4. I thirdly observe that this Author, who is so profuse in his Refutation of a few Lines in my Book, hath, in his own, given occasion (to any one who were of as scripturient a Disposition as himself) for vast Volums: as in his sarcastick denyal of *Ruling Elders*, P. 8. *That Presbyters, in the Cyprianick Age, were seldom called Pastors.* P. 9. That *there can be no Church without a Bishop.* P. 19. That *the Bishops Power is Monarchical.* p. 22. That *the Bishops Deed is the Churches Act.* p. 24. That *Episcopacy is of Divine Institution.* p. 26. That *he is subordinate to none.* p. 27, 28, 35. That *the Bishop is a supream Ecclesiastical Magistrat.* p. 43. And *Majesty* is ascribed to him, *Ibid.* he is called a *Soveraign and Peerless Governour.* p. 65. *Supream and unaccountable Power* is ascribed to him. p. 67. These, and many more such Assertions, are the Stars by which his

Treatises is bespangled: And each of them might afford matter for a long Discourse, to one who hath nothing else to do. A fourth Remark is, that through the whole course of his Argumentations he useth such confidence, and these Pretences to conclusive and irrefragable evidence, as may fright an unintelligent or unwarrie Reader; while the strength of his Ratiocinations is no way proportionable, but apparent to be built on Words rather than Matter. Every one knoweth that the Signification of several Words used about Ecclesiastical Things in *Cyprian's* time, was far different from what is our modern Dialect. The truth of this will, I hope, be more fully manifest in our considering his particular Arguments.

§. 5. My Assertion against which his Book is levelled, he seemeth to wonder at, as *strangely rash*, and a *putting our being, or not being. Schismaticks, on a desperate Issue.* The Assertion is, *a Bishop in Cyprian's time was not a Diocesan, with sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination: If he prove that, we shall give* Cyprian, *and him, leave to call us Schismaticks. A Bishop, then, was the Pastour of a Flock, or the Moderator of a Presbyterie: If he can prove that we separate from our Pastours, or from the Presbytery, with their Moderator, under whose Inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will: But we disown the Bishops in* Scotland *from being our Bishops; we can neither own their Episcopal Authority, nor any pastoral Relation they have to us.* He seemeth p. 1. to divide his Book into two parts: *First*, to *take to Task what I had said*; to wit, the words above set down. 2. *to add, perchance, something concerning our main Argument.* The first part he hath largely insisted on: with what Strength or Success, I am now to examine. Of the 2, I find nothing, but that, p. 94. he hath fairly waved it; But with confidence that he could accomplish it: and leaving to the person to whom he directeth this long Letter, to command him to prosecute what is left undone. The Import of which is, that it is much more his Inclination to write *ad hominem*, against a particular person; than *ad rem*, for that which he taketh to be the truth of God.

§. 6. His

§. 6. His first work is to expose the above-mentioned Passage in my Book, as yielding *a large Field, if one had a mind to catch at Words*, and that *it were easie to insist on such escapes, if one had a mind for it.* His first Remark is, *Suppose the word* Dioceſs *was not in use in St.* Cyprian's *time, as applyed to a Bishops District, doth it follow that the thing now signified by it was not then in use. Answ.* Pray Sir, who made that Consequence: the Words cited (catch at them as much as you will) import no such Consequence, and design no more but that which we call now a *Diocesan Bishop*, with sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination, was not in that Age. His next Remark is in this Question, *What could move him* (the Author of the Passage now under Debate) *to insinuate that we assign the sole power of Jurisdiction and Ordination to our Diocesan Bishop. Answ.* It is a greater wonder, what should move this Author to except against our thinking that they assign such Power to their Bishop, seing himself ascribeth all that Power to the *Cyprianick-Bishop*, and affirmeth him to be of *Divine Institution*; as hath been already observed: Hath he not said, that *the Bishops Power is Monarchial*, pag. 23, 32. and expresly, *pag.* 38. near the end he saith, *the Bishop had the sole Power of Ordination*: and saith, *it hath been frequently and fully proved by learned men, that he need not insist on it*: and *pag.* 39. telleth us of *Cyprian's Ordaining without asking the consent of the Clergy or People*: and pleading for this as the *Right of all Bishops.* If he do not ascribe this sole Power to his *Scots-Bishops*, then (*ex tuo ore*) they are not the *Bishops that Christ instituted*: Nor these of *the Cyprianick-Age*; nor *these for whom the learned men that he speaketh of, hath pleaded*: neither can I gueſs what kind of *Animals* he will make them: they must be a *species* of Bishops that never man pleaded for but himself. I suppose his Lords the Bishops will give him small thanks thus for pleading their Cause. What I have now observed, sheweth his Questions to be impertinent, *viz. When did our Bishops claim that Power, and when was it ascribed to them by this Constitution? When did they exercise it? When was it thought necessary for raising a Bishop to all the due Elevations of the Episcopal Authority?* I give this general

neral Answer to all these Questions: our *Scots* Bishops look on themselves, and are lookt on by their Underlings, and by this Author, as *Scripture-Bishops*; or at least, as *Primitive-Bishops*, and the *Bishops that the learned men of this, and the preceeding Ages have pleaded for*: but our Author saith these had the Power we now speak of: and therefore he must say, that that Power *was given them by the Institution*; that *they do claim it*, and *ought to claim it, that it is necessary for their due Elevation*. If they shun to exercise it, at least openly, by not laying on of Hands without Presbyters; it is because they know that practice cannot take, nor be born with in a Nation where Parity hath been so much known, and generally liked: I always understood that the main thing debated between us and the Prelatists, was about the *sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination*: and I am not alone in this; the *Synod of* London, *Vindication of Presbyterial Government*, pag. 24. proposeth the Controversie in the same Words. So doth also *Smectymnus*, §. 8, 9. and I think he will not find many (if any one) of either side, who handleth this Controversie without respect to this Power. To his Question, *When was it ascribed to them by the Constitution*: I Answer, it was done, with respect ro Ordination, *anno* 1635, in the *Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical*, chap. 2. §. 3. where the Examination of the Candidate (and consequently the Power of determining who shal be ordained) is laid on the Bishop: and he is allowed to perform this Examination by himself, or his Chaplain. And for *Jurisdiction*, a person ordained to a Charge may not Preach, unless he be also licensed by the Bishop, *ibid. chap.* 7. §. 5 Nor may he refute Error preached by another, unless he first ask and obtain leave of the Bishop, *ibid.* §. 7. Yea, a Presbyter may not go a Journey for some time, without the Bishops leave: nor stay unduly at *Edinburgh*, but he must be censured by the Bishop; *chap.* 4. §. 3, 5. And in general, in all these *Canons*, all Church-Discipline is laid on the Ordinary; that is the Bishop: not a word of Censure inflicted by the Presbyters. Without the Bishop no Minister may appoint a Fast; not in his own Congregation, *chap.* 14. and *chap.* 18. §. 10. The

Sentence

Sentence of Deprivation of a Presbyter is pronounced only by the Bishop: no consent of Presbyters is sought; only the presence of three or four, whom the Bishop calleth, is required.

§. 7. The import of the distinctions he useth for illustrating this Matter must be, that our *Scots*-Bishops have in *Jurisdiction and Ordination, a chief Power, tho' not a sole Power: a Power superior to, but not exclusive of other Powers: a Power without, and against which no Power can act; but not a Power destroying and disabling all other Powers.* We should better have understood him if he had opened the terms of these Distinctions: I confess, *qui bene distinguit bene docet*, but not *qui obscurè distinguit*. I observe none of these Distinctions clear to us, whether he thinketh our Bishops can Ordain, Depose, *&c.* without the concurrence of Presbyters, acting authoritatively with them: as he alledgeth the *Cyprianick-Bishops* might do: and seing he doth not determine this, I know not what his Distinctions serve for, but to make a noise with Words. His first distinction between *chief* and *sole Power*, if *easily made* (as he saith) is not so easily applyed to the case in hand: for our Question is about *sole Power*, and if he deny that to them, whatever other Power he give them, he maketh them no such Bishops as he after pleadeth for. Beside, the word *chief* is ambiguous; it may be taken either for Dignity, that the Bishop's Power tho' the same with the Presbyters, yet is more conspicuous because of the dignity of the Bishops person or office: or that the Bishop can do some acts of Power which the Presbyter cannot do: or that the Presbyter's Power is derived from the Bishop, or that he cannot exercise it unless the Bishop pleaseth: The first Sense, I suppose will not please our Bishops, for it importeth no Imparity of Power. In all the other Senses, the Bishop's Power *is sole*; at least as to these things about which he hath that Power. His second Distinction is the same, in different words: the third differeth little; for if Presbyters cannot act except the Bishop please, and if they must follow his Light, whatever be their own, I see not what Power they have. What Power is given to our Bishops by their Constitution, I shall not farther determine; but it may be made appear, that they have exercised

exerciſed, and conſequently claimed a Power over whole Presbyteries, which maketh void all their Power, while they have commanded them to deſiſt from proceeding to Cenſure Scandalous Offenders; of which I can give Inſtances. His third and laſt Remark is, that *that part of my Definition of a Biſhop is looſe and ambiguous, wherein I call him the Paſtour of a Flock*: for ſaith he, *may not a Biſhop and his Dioceſs be called a Paſtour and his Flock, as well as a Presbyterian Miniſter and his Pariſh? Anſw.* He might eaſily have underſtood my words in our ordinary Dialect, now in uſe; and then all Ambiguity had evaniſhed: but I cannot make him underſtand my words unleſs he will: we uſe not to call a Biſhops Dioceſs the Flock, nor him the Paſtour: nor did Scripture ſo uſe theſe terms; ſeing the Paſtour is to feed the Flock, *Act.* 20. 28. which he muſt do, not only by Ruling, but alſo by Teaching; which I am ſure a Biſhop cannot to his Dioceſs. That a Biſhop in our modern ſenſe, was called the Paſtour, and ſuch a Dioceſs as ours, his Flock, in *Cyprian's* time, we deny: and ſhall conſider his Proofs of this, when he ſhall propoſe them. I have run over his *large field*, and find not what fruit he hath reaped from it: nor the eſcapes that he thinketh it ſo eaſy to inſiſt on, *p.* 2. at the end.

§. 8. In the ſenſe he giveth of what I had aſſerted, which he enlargeth upon, *p.* 3. I have little to obſerve: for I am ready to maintain all that he there maketh to be my Opinion; except, that he ſaith, that *in the Presbyterian ſenſe, a Moderator, as ſuch, is no Church-Governour*; which I cannot agree to: but becauſe he hath this over again, and improves againſt us that Notion, (which is his own, none of ours,) *p.* 35, 36. I ſhall there conſider it, *viz.* §. 20. It is true, the *Vindication of Ch. of S. in Anſwer to the the ten Queſtions*, Q. 1. §. 5. Saith, *that a Moderator as ſuch, is no Church-Governour*; but it is evident to any who impartially conſidereth what is there ſaid, that no more is meant, but that he is not a Church-Governour of another *Species* from the reſt, or who hath another ſort of Authority than they, or a Superior Power to them: not, as our Author would improve it, that it is not needful that

that he hath the ſame Church Power with the reſt; but *may be a Heathen*, as he affirmeth, *p.* 35, 36. Alſo becauſe he inferreth from what I had ſaid, that my Opinion is, that in *Cyprian's time, the Church was governed by Presbyters Acting in Parity, after the Presbyterian Model, p.* 4. It will be needful, before I examine his Arguments, to give a more full and diſtinct Account of my thoughts in this Matter, than is done in that ſhort hint which his whole Book is imployed againſt: and this is the rather needful, becauſe my Antagoniſt doth not ſo plainly as were to be wiſht, ſtate the Controverſie, when he ſaith; *p.* 4. *If I ſhall prove, firſt, that a Biſhop in* Cyprian's *time, was more than the Paſtour of a Flock, or Moderator of a Presbytery, in the Presbyterian ſenſe.* 2. *That he had really Genuine Epiſcopal or Prelatick Power.* 3. *That he Acted in a real Superiority over, not in Parity with Paſtours; our Author is bound to acknowledge himſelf and his Brethren to be Schiſmaticks.* I ſhall ſtate the Queſtion a little more diſtinctly; but not diſown any of the Terms in which he hath put the Queſtions, all which three, are indeed but one Queſtion.

§. 9. Let it then be conſidered firſt, that we never thought, nor ſaid, that Church-Government was in all it's Modes and Circumſtances in the third Century, (in which *Cyprian* lived) the ſame with what it is now among *Scots* Presbyterians: the Subſtance of Government may remain, and yet conſiderable Alterations be made in the Modes of mannaging it, in the Succeſſion of Years; much more of Ages: We confeſs many words relating to Church-Offices, Officers, and Adminiſtrations, ſignified another thing then, than they do in our Modern Dialect: theſe we call Moderators, and my Antagoniſt calleth Biſhops, were then conſtant; among us they ſerve in that Station but for ſome ſmall time, and give place to others: in the *Affrican* Church theſe they called *Primates*, (whom yet we deny to have had either Sole, or Superior Juriſdiction) were the eldeſt Miniſter of every Province; which afterward was changed, and they choſen according to their Perſonal Qualifications: and *Metropolitans* were the Biſhops of the chief Cities; which had no Superi-

or Power; but only ſometimes præſided in Synods. *Cyprian* diſowned that any of them was *Epiſcopus Epiſcoporum*. See *no Evidence for Dioceſan Churches or Biſhops*, *p.* 28. Alſo *L' Arroque adverſar. Sacr. Lib.* 2. *C.* 14. maketh this plain. And *Leidecker. diſſert. de ſtatu Eccleſ. Affric.* §. 7. he ſheweth that *Primates* were above *Metropolitans* in Dignity, and that they firſt attained that Degree by their Age, reckoning it from their Ordination: and the other from the City where they had their Charge. Yea there hath been no Age of Old, or in later times, in which there have not been ſome leſſer differences in Management, even among Churches which uſed the ſame *Species* of Church-Government, for Subſtance: as at this day, in *Scotland*, *Low-Countries*, *Geneva*, among the *Switzers*; *&c.* Some Churches are more and ſome leſs pure, and near to the Pattern: and yet all governed by Presbyters Acting in Parity: and among the Prelatiſts, Prelatick Power is higher in one Church than in another; as in *England* now, and in *Scotland* of late? Wherefore our Author muſt not think to triumph, if he can ſhew ſome difference between the *Cyprianick* Age, and our Way. *Cypr. Ep.* 75. §. 5. *Firmilian* writing to *Cyprian*, hath Inſtances to ſhew, that *in diverſe Churches, they had diverſe Practices, and yet kept Peace, one with another.* 2. We deny not that in *Cyprian's* time, there was ſome Advances made towards ſome ſort of Prelacy; tho' the Parity of Power was not then wholly taken away: as the *Myſtery of Iniquity*, in other things, ſo in that, did begin early *to Work*, even in the days of the Apoſtles, when *Diotrephes* did φιλοπρωτεύειν, affected to be *primus Presbyter*, or πρώτος; or *Moderator*, in their Meetings: and this προεδρία becoming fixed, and conſtant after the Apoſtles times, (theſe good Men not fore-ſeeing the ill Uſe that others would make of that Handle given them) it did, by inſenſible Degrees, degenerate into an undue Uſurpation: (as it is hard to get Power kept within it's due Bounds, even among the beſt men) and the Primitive Power of Presbyters, was gradually wreſted out of their hands, by the Ambition of ſome, and by the innocent Simplicity of others. Many other Corruptions had crept into the Church by that time, and this

Declenſion

Declenſion from abſolute parity went along with them: the name ἐπίσκοπος began to be appropriat to the πρώτως; and that Cuſtom being confirmed by a little time, made even humble men imagine, that ſome different Power was ſignified by that name, that they had diſtinct from others; which the reſt, who were ſo uſurped upon, did too eaſily yield; minding more the Work of Feeding, than of Ruling the Flock: and not ſeeing the fatal Conſequents of it, which afterward appeared, and were not diſcovered, till it was too late to retrieve them. 3. It is evident from the Hiſtory of the firſt Ages, that as Epiſcopacy did not arrive to it's height of a ſudden; ſo it was not at the ſame time ſettled in all the places where it obtained at laſt: the Ambition of ſome, or at leaſt their too big Thoughts of the Power that belonged to them, and the Eaſyneſs of their Com-Presbyters, made it in one place make quicker Advances, while the Humility, and ſound Judgment of others, together with the Vigilancy of theſe who with them govern'd the Church, retarded it's Progreſs in other Churches. And it is certain, that, for as much as this Contagion of the Church walked in the dark; yet it was obſerved, and oppoſed by ſome, as *Aerius*, *Jerom*, and others; as will appear in our Progreſs. *Leidecker. Diſſert. de Statu Eccleſ. Affric. §. 7. Namq; (inquit) uti ab Origine Epiſcopatus Ordinis & Præſidentiæ in Presbyterio titulus erat, (quamvis alibi ſuos terminos egrederetur) in Affrica vetus Libertas Presbyterii eſt retenta; dum Epiſcopi præſidentium honore non dominatu in Eccleſiam, aut Presbyteros gauderent.* This he not only aſſerteth, but proveth by diverſe Teſtimonies.

§. 10. Hence we may conclude, that our Author cannot prove what he pretendeth, unleſs he make it appear, that Epiſcopal Power, (ſuch as he pleadeth for) was not only acted by ſome, but generally, in the Churches of the firſt, ſecond, and third Centuries; or approved by general Conſent. Wherefore, if we can bring Teſtimonies to prove a Parity of Power among Presbyters, and that Domination over them by one was condemned; his bringing ſome Teſtimonies to the contrary, will not be found concludent. I ſay not this, as if I were afraid he can prove what he undertaketh, by the

Authentick Suffrage of any one of the Fathers of the firſt three Centuries: but that he may ſee what Weakneſs and Fallacy is in his Reaſonings on more Accounts than one. I may here add a Conjecture, on which the Reader ſhall be deſired to lay no more Weight than he pleaſeth: that, ſeing it is confeſſed by the beſt Antiquaries, that we have but little Hiſtorical Certainty of the firſt Ages of the Church, it is probable that more Oppoſition might be made to the Tendency toward Church-Domination, than we have account of: for the Topping Party might carry all before them, and others might be ſuppreſſed, or what they did, buried in ſilence: eſpecially conſidering that meek men are often too apt, rather to ſuppreſs their Sentiments, than to make much noiſe with them, to the hazarding of the Peace of the Church: and to groan under Grievances, rather than caſt the Church into a Convulſion by ſtruggling; when they do not foreſee the greatneſs of the hazard that they fear. This, I conceive, may be one part of that *Sleep*, that giveth the *Enemy* advantage *to ſow his Tares*. I ground this Conjecture on the great difference that is between the Scripture-account of Church-Government, and that of after Ages; and that the further we come down from the Scripture-times, the difference ſeemeth to be the greater; and yet we have but often, ſmall account of any ſenſible Change made at any one time.

§. 11. The Learned Author, to his *main Proofs* (as he ſpeaketh *p.* 4.) premitteth a *ſhrewd Preſumption* againſt what I hold: that *generally, the great Champions for Presbytery acknowledge that Epiſcopacy was in the Church long before* Cyprian's *time*: and he nameth *Chamier*, *Blondel*, *Salmaſius*, the Synod of *London*, *Spanhemius*, &c. What his *&c.* may contain in it's vaſt belly, I know not, but I am not afraid of any of them he hath mentioned; they are all Friends to the Cauſe I maintain, and ſay no more than I have already ſaid; but much againſt his Sentiments. It had been eaſier for me to make this appear, if he had thought fit to point at the Books, or Places of them, on which he groundeth his Aſſertion; for ſome of theſe Authors have written much: however I hope to find

find out in them what is ſufficient to my purpoſe. I begin with *Chamier*; who, *Panſtrat. Catholic. Tom.* 2. *Lib.* 10. diſcourſeth on this Subject copiouſly: but I find not one word in him, aſſerting that in the firſt three Centuries, Biſhops had the Rule of the Church above Presbyters, further than that they were above them in Dignity, and by a Priority of Order; not of Juriſdiction: far leſs that they had the *ſole Juriſdiction*, which our Author pretendeth to prove. On the contrary, that Learned Writer proveth, *C.* 3. that there was no Domination allowed in the Church, *C.* 5. that the Government of the ſeveral Churches was *Ariſtocratical*: and he ſheweth that all Presbyters at firſt were equal; but that afterward, (as he citeth *Ambroſe* and *Jerome*) *unus electus eſt, qui omnium primus eſſet, & Epiſcopus diceretur.* And on this he maketh two Obſerves: Firſt, *in Eccleſiæ Primordiis, nullos tales Epiſcopos fuiſſe, qui poſtea inſtituti fuere, qui ſuo jure reliquis è Clero præeſſent.* And he thence inferreth the abſolute Parity of Presbyters, *de Jure.* His ſecond Obſervation is, *ne tunc quidem, cum hic Epiſcoporum a Presbyteris diſtinctorum ordo eſt conſtitutus, fuiſſe Epiſcopos ut Monarchas,* (ſee how he agreeth with our Author, *p.* 23, 32.) *qui poteſtatem haberent in Clerum; ſed Principes Electos, qui rebus deliberandis præeſſent, ut neceſſe eſt in omni Ariſtocratia.* Where he ſeemeth exactly to deſcribe a Moderator, ſuch as is in our Presbyteries, and other Church Judicatories. After that *C.* 6. he had proved, that *Jure Divino Epiſcopus non eſt major Presbytero,* (contrary to our Author, *p.* 26. *C.* 7. he proveth that the Government of Provinces was alſo *Ariſtocratical*; and doth evidently make an *Arch-Biſhop* or *Metropolitan*, no more than we make the Moderator of a Synod, or of a General Aſſembly: I mean he alloweth them no more Juriſdiction. Now let any judge, with what Brow my Antagoniſt could bring *Chamier* for his Voucher, who ſo flatly contradicteth the whole of his Book.

§. 12. His next Author is *Blondel*; who will be found to do him no more Service: For the whole Deſign and ſtrain of his *Apologia pro ſententia Hieronomi* is, to prove that *Epiſcopus* and *Presbyter* were

were the same, as both in Name and Power, in the Apostolick Age of the Church; so in Power in the first, second, third, and much of the fourth Century; tho' he confesseth that the Name, & some Majority (not higher Jurisdiction) was sooner given to the Bishop. This is evident, for S. I. p 4. he saith that *Jeromes toto orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbyteris cæteris superponeretur*, occasioned by the Divisions among Christans, and saying, *Ego sum Pauli, &c.* That this, I say, was *quarto a Corinthiorum turbis sæculo*: and that *Jerome* said it, *de sui temporis hominibus*; and proveth it from *Jerome's* own words, which are, *quando non idipsum omnes loquimur, & alius dicit, ego sum Pauli, ego Appollo, ego Cephæ, dividimus spiritus unitatem, & eam in partes & in membra discerpimus.* And he saith, that *Jerome torquebat verba Paulina de Corinthiis, in eos*: Nempe, *sui temporis homines*, & p. 6, 7. he fully sheweth, that *Jerome* believed the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, from his blameing them who made Deacons equal to Presbyters. *i. e.* to Bishops Also p. 8. that in *Alexandria* (of which *Jerome* saith, that *à Marci temporibus ad Heracleam, Dionysiumq; Presbyteri unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum dixerunt*) It was but *Jus primæ Cathedræ presbyteri inter collegas fratrem spontanea hac dignatione honorantes, sedentis.* and *ibid:* he saith, *ex Hieronomi sententia episcopalia omnia ex æquo competebant*: and that every one of them was equal *Urbico papæ.* S. 2. *Blondel* proveth all the Fathers of the three or four first Ages, to have been of the same Opinion with *Jerome.* And p. 8. hath this Transition, *prodeant jam ὁμοδόξων patrum acies, qui sanctum virum (Hieronymum) seu solitarium in tecto passerem non relictum, doceant.* This he proveth from *Clemens of Rome*, from *Polycarp of Smyrna*, from *Hermes*, from *Pius* the Pope of *Rôme*, *Justin*, *Papias*, *Irenæus* and the Gallican Church in his time, *Victor* the Pope, *Clemens of Alexandria*, *Tertullian*, *Origen.* *Cyprian* also: on whose Opinion in this matter, my Antagonist stateth the whole Controversy. Wherefore I shall a little further consider what account *Blondel* giveth of his Opinion. He saith, p. 41. ὅδὲν ἀρχοντικῶς καὶ αὐθεντικῶς *toto administrationis tempore aggressus est, sed partita (quasi ex concepto voto, cum comministris cura*

ra ac potestate, Carthaginensem plebem gubernavit: and citeth *Cyprian* himself saying to his Clergy; *Sed cum per Dei gratiam venero, tunc De iis quæ vel gesta sunt, vel gerenda (sicut mutuus honor expoſcit) in communi tractabimus*: And in another Epistle, *quæ res cum omnium noſtrum Conſilium & ſententiam ſpectet, præjudicare ego, & ſoli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo.* He sheweth also; p. 43. that *Cyprian* doth always speak of the Clergy as divided only in two parts, the *Præpoſiti* and the *Deacons*, and he calleth both the *Epiſcopi* and the *Præpoſiti* Apostles: If I should cite all that *Blondel* bringeth out of *Cyprian* to this purpose, I behoved to transcribe almost four pages of his Book, of which Citations we shall have further occasion given by our Author to Discourse. It is then more evident than what he in most of his Reasonings talketh highly of, that either this Author hath not read *Blondel*, but cited him at adventure, or hath a confidence to assert what he will, tho' absurd and unaccountable.

§. 13. He is full as unhapy in his next witness, *Salmaſius*, who both in his Book *de Epiſcopis & Presbyteris* is against this Author, and in *Walo Meſſalinus*, that is commonly ascribed to him, doth strongly maintain the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, against *Petavius* the Jesuit, in the first Ages; and is far from acknowledging any further Difference between them till *Jerome*'s time, (which was after *Cyprian*'s, about which we now contend) than of greater Dignity; for Chap 3. he sheweth that the Primacy among Presbyters was from their Seniority; and more fully, *Ch.* 4. p. 273. *credibile eſt* (saith he) *circa medium ſecundi ſæculi non alias in Eccleſia fuiſſe cognitos Epiſcopos quam qui primatum in presbyterio adepti eſſent, cum primos faceret non electio, ex merito ſed ordinationis tempus: quem morem diu in Eccleſia duraſſe, Teſtis eſt ille Author qui Ambroſii nomine, commentarios in Epiſtolas Pauli ſcripſit*: and a little below, πρωτοκαθεδρία *dabatur ei qui ordinatione antiquior cæteris eſſet. C. etiam.* 6. *oſtendit juriſdictionem epiſcopalem ortam partim ex diſtinctione nominis Epiſcopi a Presbyteri appellatione; partim principum Chriſtianorum indulgentia, partim pontificum Romanorum aliorumq; ambitione & uſurpatione*

patione. Who then can imagine that he thought that in *Cyprian's* time (which was before the Church had Christian Princes) the Bishops had sole Jurisdiction. The last of his Authors that he citeth is, the *Provincial Assembly of London*; what Book he meaneth, I know not: neither doth he himself, for what appeareth: For the *Vindication of Presbyterian Government & Ministry by the Ministers and Elders of the provincial Synod of* London, hath not a word on that Head, neither for him nor against him: wherefore I can gues at none but *jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, written (as the Title page beareth) *by sundry Ministers of Christ within the City of* London: In that Book I find nothing that hinteth the Concession that he alledgeth: But on the contrary, p. 140. (interpreting κυβερνήσεις mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 12.28.) they have this passage, *not the Prelatical Bishops, pretending to be an Order above preaching Presbyters, and to have the Reins of all Church-Government in their Hands only: For in Scripture Bishop and Presbyter are all one Order,* ——*hereunto also the Judgement of Antiquity evidently subscribeth, accounting a Bishop and a Presbyter to be one and the same Office in the Church; as appeareth particularly in* Ambrose, Theodoret Jerome, *and others.* I shall not hope to say any that is convincing, if what I have brought do not perswade the unbyassed Reader that our famous Presbyterians have the same Sentiments of the Judgement of the first Antiquity, about the power of Presbyters in the Church, that I expressed in the place that our Author maketh such a pother about: he bringeth also *Spanhem* against me, which I wonder at; seing the words himself citeth amount to no more than *manifesta* πρεσβεία, which none of us ever denyed to have crept early into the Church: but he dealeth not fairly with that learned Writer, (if this Appellation may be used without his offence) for he curtaileth his words, leaving out what displeaseth him. *viz. quanquam de primis* (Episcopis) *controversum, diverse ne an superioris ordinis haberentur.* he dealeth yet less Christianly with the same Author, both in detracting from his knowledge of Antiquity; and also in mis-representing his words, out of which he would make good his Charge: in that he saith *Spanhem* denyeth *Exorcists*

to

to have been in the Church in the third Century: whereas he doth not mention *Exorcists* in that place, but only *Ostiarios*, *Copiatas*, *Acolythos*: These last our Author will prove to have been in the Church in *Cyprian*'s time, out of *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 7. 34, 45, 59 and 77. And mentioneth several Names of Men in that Office. I was at the pains to read over all these Epistles on this occasion, and find not a word in any of them, either of *Acolyths*, or of any of the persons whom he nameth: it is like the Epistles of *Cyprian* are diversly numbred in diverse Editions: my Edition of *Cyprian* is 1593, *cum notis Pamelii*. I find the Epistle of *Cornelius* in *Eusebius*, *Lib.* 6. *C.* 42. (he calleth it 43) how genuine that Epistle of *Cornelius* is, or the Account that *Ensebius* giveth of it, I shall not now enquire: what I am now concerned in is, that the Learned World beareth Testimony to *Spanhemius*, so as this Author will not be able to derogate from his Credit: And I doubt not but he can give grounds for what he wrote. I hope I have said enough to shew that I am not so arrogant, nor so rash, as to reced in this matter, from the Sentiments of these great Patrons of Presbytery that he hath brought against me.

§. 14. He proceedeth (*pag.* 5.) to his other Arguments. His first Argument (which he manageth to *pag.* 11.) is built on three Foundations, or Pillars; the first is, that *every Church was, in* Cyprian's *time, ruled by a Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons.* This I deny not: only I observe a few things: one is, that our Controversie is not about the Name Bishop, being appropriat to one and not given in common to all the Presbyters, as at first; but about that Bishop, or first Presbyter's Power; ; which this his Discourse doth not touch. Another thing that I observe is, that it cannot be denyed that the Deacons, in that Age, and may be sooner, had more Hand in the Government of the Church than was allowed by Divine Institution; by which they were only Servants, not Rulers; and their work was only about the Poor. I thirdly observe our Author's unwarrineſs, in here asserting that the Church was ruled by Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; and yet he pleadeth for the

Biſhops ſole Juriſdiction, in moſt of his Book: This I impute to want of a good memory. What he hath *p.* 6. of *Superinducing a Biſhop where one already was*, and *that there could be but one Biſhop in a Church*, will after fall in to be conſidered: where he inſiſteth more directly and fully on it. His ſecond ground that his Argument is built on, is, that *the Presbyters in that Age were Preaching-Presbyters, and not Ruling-Elders, ſuch as we have in the Presbyterian Church.* That the Biſhop in that Age was diſtinct even from Preaching-Elders, or Miniſters, we deny not; and that there were many ſuch where was but one Biſhop, we acknowledge: ſo it is with us; there are many Miniſters where there is but one Moderator, and many Ruling-Elders, where there is but one Miniſter or Parochial Biſhop. What ſort of Officers in the Church the Presbyters, diſtinguiſhed from the Biſhop were, in the Primitive times, is controverted among ſome: Dr. *Hammond* held that only Biſhops were of Divine Inſtitution, and were in the Apoſtolick-Church; the conſequent of which is, that Presbyters muſt be a device of men and brought in afterward: this is ſolidly refuted by the learned Mr. *Durham* on *Revelation*, ch. 3. p. (*mihi*) 230. The Author of the Book Intituled, *An Inquiry into the Conſtitution*, &c. *of the Primitive-Church in the firſt* 300 *years*, who pretendeth that this work is done *by an impartial Hand*, he alſo hath a like Notion, *p.* 72. and maintaineth that *Presbyters are not neceſſary to the Conſtitution of a Church; that they are equal to a Biſhop in Order; and have all the Power that he hath; but inferior in Degree; that they were ordained Preachers; but had no particular Charge; but were imployed by the Biſhop in any piece of Church-work, as he thought fit, and ſo were his Curats, or Aſſiſtants.* But of this afterward. I deny not that there were Presbyters in the third Century, ſuch as our Author contendeth for, that is perſons authorized to preach the Goſpel and adminiſter the Sacraments, diſtinct from Biſhops. For his Sarcaſm againſt Ruling-Elders, who have no Authority to Preach, affirming *pag.* 8. that *there is as profound ſilence of them in* Cyprian's *Writings and time, as there is of the Solemn*

lemn League and Covenant, or the Sanquhar Declaration; this sheweth more of his Spite against that Church-Office, than of his Skill to refute it.

§. 15. It might have been expected from this peremptory Confidence, that he should have attempted a Refutation of what many Learned Men have written on that Subject; if he lookt into that Controversie: the *London Ministers*, (whom he citeth) could have taught him, at least, to speak more soberly: so *Blondel de Jure Plebis*, p. 79. &c. *Smectym. L'Arroque Conformity of the Discipline of the Church of* France *with the Primitive Church. Calvin. P. Martyr.* and many later Writers: at least he might have had some regard to *Arch-Bishop Whitgift*, (a Zealous Pleader for Prelacy) as he is cited by *Synod* Lond. *Vindication of* Presbyterial *Government. I know* (saith he,) *that in the* Primitive *Church, they had in every* Church *Seniors, to whom the Government of the* Church *was committed; but that was before there was any* Christian *Prince, or Magistrat.* I hope then that it was in *Cyprian's* time will not be denyed. May be, on second thoughts, he will abate a little of this Confidence, when he considereth these few Citations following: which do plainly prove that both before and after *Cyprian's* time, there were Ruling Elders, who were not Preachers, acknowledged in the Church, *Origen. Lib.* 3. *contra Celsum*: ἐισί τινες τεταγμένοι, &c. *There are some appointed, who do enquire into the Life and Manners of them who are Admitted; that they may debar from the Congregation, such as commit vile things; and receive such as abstain from these; and make them daily better.* Tertul. Apol. C. 3. *Præsident probati quiq; Seniores, honorem istum non prætio, sed testimonio adepti.* These were before *Cyprian.* After him were *Jerom*, on *Isaiah* 3. 2. *Et nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum*, &c. *August.* Ep. 137. *Dilectissimis Fratribus, Clero, Senioribus, & Universæ Plebi Ecclesiæ Hipponensis.* Where he maketh a plain Distinction between the Clergy, and these other Elders, and also the Body of the People: these Elders then were not Teachers, and they were above the People.

The like he hath, *contra Crescentium*, Lib. 3. C. 1. *Omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, & Seniores scitis.* *Et ibid.* C. 56. *Peregrinus Presbyter, & Seniores Ecclesiæ Musticanæ*, &c. The same *Augustin*, in his account of the Purgation of *Cæcilianus*, and *Felix*, accused by the *Donatists*, mentioneth several Letters Recorded in the publick Acts, (which must certainly speak the Language of that Age,) wherein Ruling Elders distinguished from Preaching Presbyters, are plainly, and often mentioned: as *Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, Seniores*: again, *Clerici, & Seniores Cirthensium*: also a Letter directed *Clero & Senioribus*: and another, *Clericis & Senioribus*: Likewise the Epistle of *Purpureus* to *Sylvanus* hath these words, *Adhibete Clericos, & Seniores Plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, & inquirant diligenter quæ sint istæ Dissentiones*: where it is clear that the Ecclesiastical Consistory was then made up of these Elders, as one sort of its Constituent Members; and that they had Authority to take Course with Disorders in the Church, in Conjunction with the Teachers of the Church. Even *Gregorius Magnus* the Pope, in the end of the sixth Age, sheweth that such Elders were still in the Church; *Tabellarium* (saith he) *cum consensu Seniorum & Cleri memineris ordinandum.* Also, *Lib.* 2. *Epist.* 19. *Si quid de quocunque Clerico ad aures tuas pervenerit, quod te juste possit offendere, facile non credas, sed præsentibus Ecclesiæ tuæ Senioribus est perscrutanda veritas, & tunc si qualitas rei poscit, Canonica Districtio culpam feriat delinquentis.* Is it imaginable that there were no Ruling Elders in *Cyprian's* time, in the third Century, and yet after three hundred years, they were revived again; when Episcopal Tyranny, and manifold Corruptions in the Church were come to a greater height? *Isidor. Hispal. Sent. Lib.* 3. *C.* 43. *Prius docendi sunt Seniores Plebis, ut per eos infra positi facilius doceantur.*

§. 16. It is yet more fully against this Author's bold Assertion, that even in *Cyprian's* time it self, this Office was in the Church; as Witness the Writers of that Age, *Basil. in Psal.* 33. *Quatuor gradus Ministrorum constituit, quod scil. alii sunt in Ecclesia instar Oculorum, ut Seniores; alii instar Linguæ, ut Pastores; alii*

tanquam

tanquam Manus, ut Diaconi; &c. And *Optat. Milevit. Lib.* 1. *adv. Parmen.* telleth us of certain p ecious Utenſils of the Church, which in a time of Perſecution, could neither ſafely be tranſported, nor hid in the Earth; and therefore they were committed to the Cuſtody of the faithful Elders of the Church. From all this it is evident, that if expreſs and diſtinct mention be not made of this ſort of Elders by *Cyprian*, it is either becauſe he had no occaſion; or that he comprehended them under the general name of Presbyters, as the Scripture ſometimes doth under the name of Biſhops: for it is not to be imagined that *Cyprian*, in this, was of a different Sentiment from the Church, before, in, and after his time.

§. 7. His third Foundation for his Argument is, that *the Biſhops Power, Authority, Paſtoral Relation, extended to all Chriſtians within his Diſtrict*: and a little after, *the Biſhops Prelation, what ever it was, related not ſolely to the Clergy, nor ſolely to the Laity; but to both equally and formally*: this we are no way concerned to oppoſe; for we think every Miniſter hath a Relation to the Univerſal Church, and Authority with Reſpect to all the Members of it: and more particularly within the Presbytery whereof he is a Member: and yet more fully toward theſe of the Congregation he is ſet in, whether Elders or People. Neither is our Queſtion about the Extent of the Biſhop's Power, as to Perſons, ſo much as about the Solitude of this Power; whether Church Power reſide in his Perſon alone, or be in the Community of Presbyters. I might diſmiſs this whole Section; but that his Proofs ſeem not ſo much levelled at this Concluſion; as at ſome other things which we cannot ſo eaſily comply with: he telleth us of *Cyprian's defining the Church, to be a People united to the Prieſt, and a Flock adhering to their Paſtour*: he bringeth Citations to prove, that *where a Biſhop is wanting, the People hath no Ruler, the Flock no Paſtour, the Church no Governour, Chriſt no Prelate, and God no Prieſt*: and he will have Presbyters to be but *Vice-Paſtours*. Now how far is all this from his Concluſion; *viz.* that the

the Bishop's Power extendeth to all the People? All this tendeth to prove the Bishop's sole Jurisdiction, which is afterward to be considered, where he insisteth on that point on purpose: but here here he doth nothing but make a Parade with a parcel of impertinent Citations: I shall only now tell him; that this may be well understood of a Parish Bishop or Minister. For Presbyters being *Vice-Pastours*, that is afterward answered. Wherefore I now consider his Application of his three Conclusions to what he would prove; *viz.* that *a Bishop in* Cyprian's *time, was neither the Pastour of a Flock, nor the Moderator of a Presbytery; in my sense of the terms: not the first for* Cyprian *at* Carthage, Cornelius *at* Rome, &c. *had many such* Pastours *under them: yea, it was so over all the World. Not the second; because a* Presbyterian *Moderator as such, is no Church Governour at all: hath no direct, immediat, formal relation to the People, but only to the* Presbytry. This is the goodly Argument in which our Author early triumpheth, as sufficient, if there were no more, to ruine our Cause.

§. 18. This Triumph will be found to be before the Victory: That I may give a full and direct Answer to his Argument, I must distinguish what our Author confoundeth, *viz.* the signification of the word *Bishop* in the Apostles time, it signified any ruling, ordinary Officer in the Church: hence *Phil.* 1. 1. all Church-Officers are so called, except the Deacons. And 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2, *&c.* The Apostle giveth Directions to all the Ruling-Officers in the Church, and then *vers.* 8, *&c.* telleth what manner of Men the Deacons should be. If the Apostle had known any other ordinary Church-Officers, these Canons had been very lame: and indeed it is no wonder that the Bishops (not being here comprehended) do what they will; for we know no Scripture, rules neither for their Qualifications, nor Work: and *Tit.* 1. 5, and 6. the Elders that were to be set up in every City are called Bishops, *v.* 7. the same Word in after Ages, as it was sometimes given to Pastours of particular Congregations, so it was ordinarily given to the πρῶτος the *primus Presbyter* or *Moderator* in the Colledge of Presbyters: and the same

that

that ſuſtained the later of theſe Relations had alſo the former, and laboured in the Word and Doctrine, and managed Congregational-Diſcipline in a particular Pariſh, taking the Word Pariſh in our modern ſenſe. Wherefore if the Citations he bringeth for Epiſcopal Power can rationally be applyed to either of theſe Notions of a Biſhop, our Cauſe is ſafe from his Aſſaults. That the Moderator of the Colledge of Presbyters is called Biſhop, not only is evident from *Jerom*, *Unus è Presbyteris electus eſt qui cæteris ſuperponeretur* —— *Epiſcopi noverint ſe magis conſuetudine quam diſpoſitionis dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris eſſe majores, & in communi debere Eccleſiam regere*: but this Author cannot deny it; tho' he pleadeth for an extravagant Power to that his Moderator; about which Power I now debate with him.

§. 19. That the Paſtour of a particular Flock was alſo (in the Primitive Times) called a Biſhop, is certain from this, that the Scriptures dividing the Church-Officers in Biſhops and Deacons, are by the Fathers ſo applyed: as I have ſhewed elſewhere. Likewiſe we find Biſhops in ſmall Villages, where were no number of Paſtors, over whom the Biſhop might præſide: as is fully proved by the learned Mr. *Clarkſon*, *Primitive Epiſcopacy ſtated*, &c. *c.* 2. *p.* 19, &c. and that by multitudes of Inſtances, as alſo Teſtimonies of Fathers, aſſerting it to be then uſual, *Sozomen Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 19. telleth us that in *Arabia* ἐν κώμαις ἐπισκοποι ἱιδρύνται: he ſaith the ſame of *Cyprus*, and extendeth his Aſſertion to other Countries, ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν. Mr. *Fuller* (tho' Epiſcopal, yet a perſon of more Ingenuity than many others) *Hiſtory of the Holy War*, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *p.* 45, & 46. ſpeaking of *Paleſtine*, *at this time* (ſaith he) *Biſhops were ſet too thick for all to grow, and* Paleſtine *fed too many Cathedral-Churches to have them generally fat*: Lydda, Jamnia, *and* Joppa, *three Epiſcopal Towns, were within four Miles one of another*: —— *neither let it ſtagger the Reader, if in that Catalogue of* Tyrius, *he light on many Biſhops Seats which are not to be found in* Mercator, Ortelius, *or any other Geographer*; *for ſome were ſuch poor Places as they were aſhamed to appear in a Map.* —— *For in that Age, Biſhops had*

had their Sees at poor and contemptible Villages. *Concil. Antioch.* in their Epistle concerning *Paulus Samosatenus* they mentioned Bishops ἀγρῶντες καὶ πολεῶν. I know Dr. *Maurice* pretendeth to refute Mr *Clarkson*'s Book: neither shall I judge who hath the better in most parts of that Debate; but I see no sufficient Answer to what I have here quotted. Yet do I not joyn with Mr. *Clarkson* in the whole design of his Book. These two Notions of a Bishop being familiar in the Primitive Times, it is no wonder if we find the Fathers sometimes speaking of a Bishop in the one Sense, and sometimes in the other.

§. 20. I now Answer his Argument: a Bishop in *Cyprian*'s time was always the Pastor of a particular Flock, and Moderator in the Consistory of Ruling-Elders; but sometimes he was also the Moderator of a Colledge of Presbyters; and so might have many Presbyters under him; that is, he was above them in Dignity; and we deny not but that by reason of his fixation in that Office, he by custom had crept into some more Power over them than was due: but that in *Cyprian*'s time, he had the sole Power of Jurisdiction, and Ordination, or such Authority as our *Dioceſans* pretend to; I utterly deny. For the other part of his Argument, that he could not be a *Moderator, because a Moderator as such, hath no Church Power, nor is a Church Governour.* I Answer first; the Assertion he here reflecteth on, cited by him *pag.* 3. that a *Moderator, as such, hath no Church Power*, was not meant, that there might be a Moderator who hath no Church Power, and so taking As *specificative*: as he absurdly improveth it, *p.* 36. affirming *that a Heathen may be the Moderator of a Presbytery without repugnancy to any Principle of Christianity, tho' not without indecency and inconvenience.* I say this is a most absurd Assertion, both because a Heathen Moderator could not understand the Affairs of the Church; And because he would embarasse them: and because it is against common sense, and the Sentiments of Mankind, that an Enemy of the true Religion should have the Conduct, and main hand in mannaging the Affairs that do so nearly concern it: Yea, this his Assertion contradicteth it self: for he

he acknowledgeth that this were Indecent and Inconvenient, and I hope he will not deny, that it is a Principle of the Christian Religion, that *all things be done Decently, and in Order*: and that both Nature and Religion require, that we should shun what is *inconvenient*, especially to so high Concernments as are these of Religion. That Assertion then, that he aimeth at, is to be understood *reduplicative*; that is, that a Moderator acquireth no Church Power by his being Moderator, above what he had as a Pastor of the Church: and here a Sub-distinction is to be used, he acquireth indeed an *Ordinative Power*, in that he ordereth the Meeting to avoid Confusion, and many call it *pre re natâ*; but he acquireth no *Decisive Power*: he getteth a Power to be their *Mouth*, not *their Will, or Commanding Faculty*: *to keep Order in the Management of what cometh before them, not to Determine what is Debated among them*, as it is expressed in the place he citeth; and which might have prevented this Cavil, if he had heeded what was said. To conclude what I have to Reply to this his Argument, it is no Proof of such a Prelacy in *Cyprian's* time as he pleadeth for, that it related to the Laity, as well as the Clergy: for so doth that of our *Moderator*: that is, he ordereth the Affairs which concern them, which are managed in the Presbytery: and that *Cyprian* did more, or, that he managed the Affairs concerning the Laity, without the same Authoritative Concurrence of the Presbyters, is the Question, and is not concluded by this Argument.

§. 21. He undertaketh, *p.* 11. *easily to collect another Demonstration* against my Notion of a Bishop, *from the way, how in* Cyprian's *time, he was promoted to his Chair; to that Sublime Top of the Priesthood*, as he calleth it. This is to fright us with big, but empty Words: if he bring a concludent probable Argument, tho' short of a *Demonstration*, we must stoop. To *Cyprian's* Words, *the Sublime Top of Priesthood*, I should not doubt to give a satisfying Answer, if I could find the place, and consider the purpose he is speaking of; but my Antagonist hath made my Work very difficult; not by the strength of his Arguments, but by leaving me

at uncertainty where to find any one of his Citations, unleſs I either ſtumble on them caſually, or read all *Cyprian's* Epiſtles for every place that is cited: for he knoweth there are ſeveral Editions of *Cyprian*; and he hath neither told what Edition he uſeth, (I have no other at preſent, but that Printed by *Le Preux*, 1593.) nor nameth he to whom the Epiſtle is Directed: whether this be done *de induſtriâ*, or not, I ſhall not judge: but I am ſure it is a great neglect: eſpecially conſidering that *Cyprian's* Epiſtles are quite otherways numbred by *Scultetus*, than in the Edition mentioned, but I find neither of theſe can help me to find his Citations. All that I ſhall ſay about this *Sublimity* he talketh of, is, that the Fathers uſed to ſpeak big words concerning the Goſpel Miniſtry; which both *Papiſts* and *Prelatiſts* have abuſed: alſo the Biſhops Power was elevated to a higher Dignity, tho' not greater Authority, than the Presbyters, and that was their *Sublime Faſtigium Sacerdotii*. This his Argument alſo, he buildeth on ſeveral Propoſitions. The firſt is, *There could be no lawful Promotion to a Biſhoprick, where a Biſhop had been ſetled, unleſs there were a clear, Canonical, and unqueſtionable Vacancy: it was a received Maxim then, that there could be but one Biſhop at once in a Church.* Our preſent Debate is no way concerned in this Principle, whether it be true or falſe. For taking a Biſhop for Moderator; we think there ſhould be but one at one time: and that another ought not to be choſen till the place be void, by Death, Depoſition from that Office, or Ceſſion. If by Biſhop you underſtand the *Paſtor of a Flock*, whether there be one or more over a Congregation, is nothing to our purpoſe; ſeing the Queſtion is about the Power of the Biſhop, whether it be in one, or more Perſons.

§. 22. Yet I ſhall obſerve a few things on his Diſcourſe of this his Principle. 1. If I were willing to be very critical, I would ask him, what did they in thoſe days, when there was a *real*, and *lawful Vacancy*; but not *clear*, nor *unqueſtionable*; as in the Conteſt between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus* at *Rome*: and many other Inſtances that might be given, of moſt Unchriſtian, and ſometimes

times Bloody Contentions, between Biſhops pretending to the ſame See: I hope the ſound Party might, and did place a Biſhop; tho' the Vacancy was queſtioned. Next I oppoſe to his Principle, Dr. *Hammond*, on *Rev.* 11. *p.* 662. who telleth us, *there were two Biſhops at once in* Jeruſalem, Antioch, Epheſus, *and* Rome, he nameth them: and giveth Reaſons why diſtinct Congregations under their reſpective Biſhops in each City were neceſſary: he ſaith alſo it was ſo in other Cities: and his Reaſons do prove that it muſt be ſo in all Cities: where there are many People. I inſiſt not on the Biſhops at *Philippi*, Phil. 1. 1. At *Epheſus*, whom the Holy Ghoſt had made Biſhops, *Act.* 20. 20. Thirdly, I obſerve that all the Citations he here bringeth, hath this Tendency, to ſhew that *Novatus* in intruding himſelf in the Biſhop's See at *Rome*, was to be blamed, ſeing *Cornelius* was already duly ſetled in that Place. This was a plain Caſe, the Presbyters and People of *Rome* had choſen *Cornelius* to be Paſtor of a Flock, and their conſtant Moderator, as was the Practice of that Time: *Novatianus* was not only unſound in other things, but he got a Faction to chooſe him for Paſtor and their Moderator, and he with them, ſet up another *Presbytery*, in Oppoſition to that wherein *Cornelius* was fixed: I know no Presbyterian who would not condemn this Practice as much as *Cyprian* did: and it is obſervable that the Citations here brought by our Author, do not ſo much concern the Unity of a Biſhop; as the Unity of a Church, which indeed *Novatianus* had broken: I confeſs *Cyprian* here uſed Expreſſions a little too vehement, in that he not only denyeth them who make ſuch Rents to be *Paſtors*, being unduly Choſen, and Ordained; but denyeth them to be *Chriſtians*: it was a great Sin,, and deſerved the higheſt Cenſure; but it is hard to Unchriſtian all who make a Schiſm: but I impute this Fervor to the Temper of that Age, rather than of the Holy and Meek *Cyprian*: and it is like, theſe Wiſe Men ſaw a peculiar Reaſon at that time, for thus Oppoſing the Seeds of Ruine to the Church, which often lurk unobſerved in Schiſm.

§. 23. His ſecond pillar of this Argument is this Aſſertion; *there was no canonical vacancy but where the Biſhop whoſe the Chair had been was dead, had ceded, or was canonically depoſed.* Let this paſs. The third is, *when a See was thus canonically vacant, the Biſhops of that province met, chooſed and ordained one in preſence of the people whom he was to govern.* I object nothing againſt this, ſave that the Biſhops chooſed the Man to be ordained: we ſay the People had the choice, with the Elderſhip: but this Controverſie he waveth, as not belonging to this Argument; and ſo do I. His fourth Propoſition is, that *the perſon elected received new Impoſition of Hands, and new Ordination; tho' he had been ordained a Presbyter before*: this he proſecuteth p, 14. and citeth many Teſtimonies to prove what he alledgeth: he ſaith, *no doubt that each of theſe was raiſed to the Epiſcopacy by a new Ordination*: and of *Sabinus*, that *he was ordained by Impoſition of Hands*: I deny not that even an ordained Presbyter behoved to be choſen to the Office of Biſhop, before he could exerciſe it: ſo it is with our *Moderator*. That there was more Solemnity in inſtalling a Biſhop then, than we uſe in making a Moderator, cannot be denyed: that was conſequential to the Biſhops being conſtantly and for Life in that Office, and to that Prelation, or Dignity above other Presbyters that he then had. Neither ſhall I contend with him about *Impoſition of Hands* to have been in that caſe uſed; (tho' after ſearch, I cannot find the place he citeth) for it is well known, that in the Apoſtolick Church (and it is like it continued in after Ages) *Impoſition of Hands* was uſed when Men were ſent into a ſpecial piece of Work, tho' no new Office, or new Power was given; as *Act* 13. 3. I hope he will not ſay, that *Saul*, by that Impoſition of Hands, was promoted unto a higher, or new Office, being already an Apoſtle. But our Queſtion is, whether the Biſhop had a ſuperior Power over Presbyters, which reſided in his perſon alone: this we deny, and affirm that it is not proved by the Citations he hath brought. *The Zeal that even falſe Biſhops uſed to have all the Formalities in their promotion*

tion that were used by any other (which is one of his Topicks) is as little probative; Nor should I wonder if they exceeded: they had need of all the Pomp that could be, to make up the want of Real Right, to strenthen their weak Title. He concludeth, p. 15. that *now my Definition of a Bishop is routed a second time.* Let the Reader judge.

§. 24. He cometh to apply his former propositions, and to conclude his Argument from them. *How* (saith he) *can the Maxime of but one Bishop at once consist with the Bishops being a single Presbyter; seing in* Rome *and* Carthage *were many Presbyters, and yet each of these was but one Church. Ans.* 1. It consisteth well with the Notion of a *Moderator.* 2. It consisteth well with the Notion of a Bishop in lesser places, where was no such plurality of Presbyters; of which before. 3. I have said enough above to discredit this Maxime, in the sense our Author useth it 4. There might be a plurality of Presbyters in a particular Congregation; not only Presbyters that were only ruleing, but Preachers also: For it is observed by some, that in the primitive Times, they ordained many more preaching Presbyters in Churhes than they had present Work for: So *Mr Clerkson, primitive Episcopacy, Ch.* 5. p. 93. and he buildeth on *Nazianzens* Authority, who *Orat.* 1. Sheweth that the *Officers in Churches were some times as many as these whom they had the Charge of.* ἴδοι (saith he) σχεδόντι πλείους ἢ ὁπόσων ἀρχόσι καὶ ἀριθμὸν. It is probable, that then the Christians having no Universities, the Churches, especially in great Cities, or where were learned Bishops, were Colledges for Breeding men to the Ministry, and that when they were ripe, they ordained them and imployed them; that so they might be *Seminaries* out of which vacant Parishes might he provided: and if any will say, that the Bishop had such Authority over these Presbyters as our *Professors of Divinity* have over the *Students*, It may pass for a probable Conjecture: Only these were ordained, ours we do not ordain till we fix them in Churches: and in that time I find no such unordained Licentiats as we have.

§. 25.

§. 25. He again asketh, *If a Bishop were but a single Presbyter, why such a do, and so many Bishops conveened to elect and ordain him.* This is in part answered above. I add, we also have a Meeting of many Ministers to ordain a Presbyter to a single Flock: and also when a Moderator is chosen. As for calling Bishops of a whole province to Elect and instal a Bishop at *Rome*, and at *Carthage*, that was needful, because these were the fixed Moderators in these Provinces; So our Moderator of a provincial Synod is chosen by no fewer than the Ministers of a whole Province: and the Moderator of the General Assembly by Ministers from the whole National Church. What he saith about their New Ordination is already Answered. That which he calleth *ridiculous* is pretty *ridiculously* by him proposed: *Viz.* that *so much ado was made about making two men Presbyters of* Rome, *who were already Presbyters of* Rome. He meaneth *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*. It was about making them Moderators of the Colledge of Presbyters, not in *Rome*, but in the whole Province: and indeed it was *lamentable*, rather than *ridiculous*: Both that that Promotion began then to be more esteemed than was meet; and was lookt on as a Prelation above the other Brethren (tho' it was far short of what our Author contendeth for) and also that there should be such unchristian Contests made about it Alas some such things have fallen out where a Diocesan Episcopacy was not pretended to. Our Sentiments about *a constant Moderator* he entertaineth in ridicule, p. 16. rather than refuteth them by Arguments: this I do little regard. Had the excellent men of the *Cyprianick Age* seen, or known the fatal Consequents of it, as we have; I judge they would not have allowed it as they did. *I.* refer the Reader for satisfaction in this Point, to Mr. *Baillie*, *Unlawfulness and danger of limited Episcopacy*: and another peice bearing the same Title, which he defendeth against a Reply made to it. That the Presbyters of *Rome* did often meet during the Vacancy of the See; and that they had a Moderator in their Meetings, none will deny: but what he inferreth is in consequential; that *they might as easily have*

have choſen a Biſhop, if he had been but Moderator. For not only the Cuſtom of having the Moderator fixed, made it more hard than to chooſe one to be their Mouth for one Meeting, or two; but alſo, (as I have ſaid) the whole Province was to be concerned in him. He argueth p. 17. in many words, *if he were Moderator, why the people was to chooſe him, or why was it needful that he ſhould be choſen in their preſence. A.* Becauſe alſo he was to be Paſtor of that Flock. That *he was no Church-Governour as Moderator*, is anſwered above: But it cannot be ſaid he was no Church-Governour under another Relation; *viz.* as Paſtor of the Congregation of *Rome*, or a Congregation in it. That *he was choſen by* 16 *Biſhops. i. e.* ſaith our Author, ſixteen *Moderators* was not then needleſs, ſeing he was to be Moderator over them to; that is over that Province. If ſixteen parochial Biſhops met to chooſe a Moderator of a Presbytery, or ſixteen Moderators from ſixteen Presbytries met to Elect him who was to præſide continually in the Synod; This cannot infer either ſole or ſuperior Juriſdiction. Further if we ſhould grant that in theſe days, a Presbyterie uſed to take the help of other Presbyteries, or their Moderators, or that help was by Cuſtom impoſed on them, this will indeed prove that ſome of the Priviledges of Presbyters began then to be abridged; but not that their ruling Power in the Church was transferred on a ſingle perſon, the Biſhop. What he further argueth p. 18. from the Biſhops *new Ordinatian*, is already anſwered.

§. 26. His next Argument (and ſome that follow) is taken from the *Biſhops relation to his particular Church*; viz. *That he is the principle of Unity to her: whoever adhered to him was in the Church, a Catholick Chriſtian; who ſeparated from him, was out of the Church, and a Schiſmatick.* Under this Head, he hath no leſs than ſix Conſiderations, which either are intended as Arguments, or ſignifie nothing. Before I come to examine theſe, I ſhall take ſome notice of his Argument, as it is here generally propoſed. And 1. I obſerve, that this very Argument is fully with as much ſtrength mannaged by the *Papiſts*, for the Pop's univerſal headſhip over the Chriſtian Church: they plead that we are not of the Church Catho-

lick

lick, are not to be reputed Christians, are Dividers of Christ's Body, &c. because we do not adhere to the *Pope*, whom they hold to be the *Principle of Unity* to the Christian Church: and the Papists reckon the Protestants as Hereticks, because they do not believe this; and Schismaticks, because they live not in Communion with the *Pope*, and that Church whereof he is Head. 2. This Doctrine, as it is by our Author crudely, and indistinctly proposed, will Un-Church some of the best and soundest Christians: for have there not been Bishops, who had as good Title to their Sees (to speak in his own Dialect,) as any could have; who afterwards turned Hereticks? How many *Arian* Bishops were there, whose Right to their Places was not contested? Will he say that all the Orthodox who separated from them, were guilty of Schism, and all the Aggravations that his Citations, *p.* 19, 20. load it with? Are we not commanded *to withdraw from them who teach unsound Doctrine*, 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5. And our Lord warnes his People against *Wolves*; and the Apostle gave Warning to the Elders of *Ephesus*, that *of themselves*, (and our Author will say they were Diocesan Bishops,) *should men arise speaking perverse things, and drawing Disciples after them.* This Argument will prove, (if it hath any force) that these their Followers were the sound Christians, and the rest Schismaticks; because the one sort adhered to their Bishop, *the Principle of Unity*; and the rest departed from him. I am far from charging my Antagonist with owning these Consequents; but I see not how he can shun the Consequence, unless he retract this his inconsiderat Opinion. Thirdly, I wish he had explained this Term, *the Principle of Unity*: which he ought the rather to have done, because he saith, *p.* 18. near the end, *this is a Point of great Consequence.* What he saith for clearing it, is very insufficient: his Metaphors out of *Cyprian*, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*; prove nothing: *viz.* that of *the Sun and Beams, the Root and Branches, the Fountain and Streams*: if they prove any thing, they prove more than, I suppose, our Author will allow: for *Cyprian*, in the very page where he useth these Similitudes,

tudes, (*p. mihi* 297.) ſpeaketh of *Peter's* Primacy, and placeth the Unity of the Chriſtian Church in him: *tamen ut Unitatem manifeſtaret, unam Cathedram conſtituit, & Unitatis ejuſdem Originem ab uno incipientem ſua authoritate conſtituit: hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli quod* Petrus, *pari conſortio prædiți & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab Unitate proficiſcitur.* And a little below, *quam Unitatem firmiter tenere & vindicare debemus, maxime Epiſcopi, qui in Eccleſia præſidemus ut Epiſcopatum quoque ipſum unum atque indiviſum probemus.* Where it may be obſerved, 1. That either *Cyprian* was abſolutely for the *Pope's* Supremacy, or he had no ſuch meaning as our Author deſigneth. 2. That *Cyprian* doth not ſo much ſpeak of the Peoples adhering to their Biſhop, (which in a ſound Senſe I am for,) as Biſhops cleaving together, and not breaking the Churches Peace, by Diviſions among themſelves. 3. That he is to be underſtood of a Principle of *Origination*, rather than of a Principle of *Dependance*: that *Peter* firſt was in Commiſſion by Chriſt, (the truth of which I ſhall not now enquire into,) and that all were obliged to adhere to that one Doctrine that he taught: not that he had Authority over the reſt; and they muſt not Diſſent from him in any Caſe: *Cyprian* plainly teacheth the contrary, in that very place: that the reſt had equal Authority with him. And if we ſhould apply all this to a Biſhop, or Miniſter in a Pariſh, it amounteth to no more but this; he receiveth the Word from the Lord, and delivereth it to the People; and if they depart from this, they are Schiſmaticks, and break the Unity of the Church: which we all acknowledge. I obſerve, 4. That this his Principle is indeed *of ſo great Moment*, that if it be true, there are neither Churches nor Chriſtians in the World, but ſuch as owne a Dioceſan Biſhop: few in our days are Chriſtians, but theſe of the *Romiſh*, and *Church* of *England* Communion: all the Reformed Churches muſt be Re-baptized, and their Miniſters Re-ordained: (as *Cyprian*, and ſome other thought of the Schiſmaticks of that time,) I hope all his Brethren are not of this Opinion. Yea it hath been condemned by the moſt famous

of his Party. When, *Anno* 1610. ſome *Scots* Biſhops were to be Conſecrated at *London*, ſome moved that they might be firſt Ordained Presbyters; their Ordination without a Biſhop being null: *Bancroft* Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* withſtood that Motion, and told them, *that thereof there was no neceſſity: ſeing where Biſhops could not be had, the Ordination given by Presbyters muſt be eſteemed lawful: otherwiſe that it might be doubted, if there were any lawful Vocation in moſt of the Reformed Churches.* This was Applauded by all the other Biſhops. *Spotſwood. Hiſt. Lib.* 7. *ad An.* 1610. *p.* 514. Whence I infer that either *Cyprian* was not of this Author's Opinion, nor can his Words be ſo underſtood; or that the *Engliſh* Biſhops were oppoſite to him and *Cyprian* too.

§. 27. What he ſaith further for clearing this his Notion about *the Principle of Unity*, is both abſurd and groundleſs: *viz.* that *he* (the Biſhop) *was the Head of all the Chriſtians living within his Diſtrict, and they were one Body, one Society, one Church, by depending on him, by being ſubject to him, by keeping to his Communion.* I ſay this is abſurd: becauſe then Separating from the moſt Heretical Superſtitious, yea, Idolatrous Biſhop, were unlawful, as above noted. It is alſo groundleſs; for neither *Cyprian*, nor any other, uſes ſuch indiſtinct, and univerſal Aſſertions in this Matter. I come to examine his ſeveral Propoſitions, by which he pretendeth to make out this his Argument. The firſt is, that *the Antients highly Valued Church Unity, and laid no more Streſs on any thing than it; and no Sin they Repreſented as more Hainous, or more Criminal than the Sin of Schiſm*: And here he is at the Pains to fill almoſt two Pages, with the Commendations of Unity, and hard Names given to Schiſm, out of *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and *Concil. Carthag.* I do not find that he is ſo Copious, and muſtereth up ſo numerous Forces againſt any Diſputable Point, as in this where he hath no Adverſary: for who ever ſpake againſt Unity in the Church, and took the Defence of Schiſm. Wherefore all this I paſs with a few ſhort Obſerves. Firſt, Tho' we have Account of ſeven ſeveral Councils at *Carthage* in the Antient Records,

cords, yet this Author always citeth *Concil. Carthag.* without any diſcrimination: if he miſcite Places, how ſhall this Error be diſcovered: for I think few will be at Pains to read over all the Acts of theſe Councils, for every one of his Citations; which are not a few. 2. We may from this Diſcourſe gather what Sentiments this Author hath of *Presbyterians*; ſeing the Deſign of his Book is to prove them Schiſmaticks; that is (according to his Citations) *Renegadoes*, *Apoſtats*, *Antichriſts*, *Malignants*, *Paricides*, *falſe Chriſts*, *Chriſt's Enemies*, *Blaſphemers*, *the Devils Prieſts*, *Retainers to* Korah, *to* Judas, *Villains*; and much more of this Stuff. Either he Applaudeth all this, or not: if not, his Citations are impertinent; if ſo, he chargeth us with all this Guilt: and I ask him, if he thinketh it juſt, that we ſhould throw back all this Dirt on himſelf and his Party, whom we reckon to be the Authors of this Schiſm that is now in this Church: for my part, I am far from dealing ſo by them: I think they are in an Error, and that that Error miſleadeth them into ſome Practices that are ſinful, and that have bad Conſequecens to the Church; but I hope there are good men among them for all that. 3. The Schiſms that occaſioned theſe vehement Diſcourſes among the Fathers, were chiefly theſe of the *Donatiſts* and *Novatians*; which were like to ruine Chriſtianity, and to make the World caſt at it, while it was not well ſetled, nor univerſally received. I hope our Differences tho' they have ſadder Effects, than I am willing to mention; yet go not that far. 4. It is well known that the Holy Zeal of the Fathers, and the excellent Rhetorick they were endowed with, made them overlaſh ſometimes in their Expreſſions: and it is evident that not a few of the Popiſh Errors had their Original, and ſome ſeeming Patrociny, from their flights of Rhetorick; their Figurative Expreſſions, and ſome Logical Niceties that they uſed. This is not my Apprehenſion alone; the Learned *Daille*, *Right Uſe of the Fathers*, hath the ſame Obſervation, *Chap.* 5. The Fathers themſelves were aware of this, with reſpect to the Writings of one another: *Hieron. Ep.* 139. *ad Cypri-*

an. Plerumque nimium diſertis accidere ſolet, ut major ſit intelligentiæ difficultas in eorum explanationibus, quam in iis quæ explanare conantur. And in Matters of greater Moment, they ſpake ſometimes unwarily, not foreſeeing what ill Uſe might be made of their Expreſſions; as *Jerom* alſo giveth us ground to think; *Apolog. contra Ruffin. vel certè* (ſaith he) *antequam in Alexandria quaſi Dæmonium meridianum Arius naſceretur, innocenter quædam & minus cautè locuti,* —*& quæ non poſſunt perverſorum hominum calumniam declinare.* *Petavius* maketh alſo the ſame Obſervation, tho' a Jeſuit, *in Panar. Epiphan. ad Hær.* 6, 9. Yea, the ſame Author hath this Paſſage; *Not. in Epiphan, multa ſunt à Sanctiſſimis Patribus preſertim à Chryſoſtomo in Homiliis aſperſa, quæ ſi ad exacta veritatis regulam accommodare volueris, boni ſenſus manca videbuntur.*

§. 28. I obſerve, 5. That tho' our Author would fright us alſo with what the Scripture ſaith of Unity, and againſt Schiſm, (which I confeſs is enough to make us love the one, and hate the other,) yet I do not find this ſtrain uſed againſt all Diviſions, in Scripture without Diſcrimination; but that another Spirit appeareth in theſe Inſpired Writings, and that more of Chriſtian Forbearance is Recommended, 1 *Cor.* 1. 11. *and* 3. *Ch.* 1. Diviſions are reproved, and with ſtrong Reaſon condemned: ſo 1 *Cor.* 11. 18. but that Weight is not laid on them that our Author ſpeaketh of: and *Philip.* 15. 16. Forbearance, and Joyning in Uncontеſted Truths and Duties is enjoyned. And I am ſure the Differences of theſe Times, were Things of more Moment, than our Biſhops Mitres, or Lordly Domination are: The Church might be in Peace, if they either would ſhew us Divine Warrant for their Prelation, or not trouble us with their Uſurpations.

§. 29. His ſecond Propoſition is, *for the Preſervation of Unity, and preventing of Schiſm, in every particular Church all were bound, in* Cyprian's *time, to live in the Biſhop's Communion, and to owne and look upon him, as the Principle of Union to that Church of which he was Head and Ruler.* I ſee not wherein this differeth from

from the former Propoſition: I am ſure it containeth no new Matter: and therefore I ſhould have taken no notice of it; but that *p.* 21. he bringeth ſome Citations that need a little to be examined. Altho' I can by no Diligence find ſome of the Places that he citeth, yet by chance I have light on theſe: and the Words he uſeth afford a plain Anſwer to his Argument brought from them. For his firſt Citation out of *Ep.* 33. (I find it in *Ep.* 27.) it maketh nothing at all for the Biſhop's ſole Power, nor for his being further *the Principle of Unity*, than what I have above granted. The Caſe was this, ſome of the Lapſed who had been received to the Peace of the Church, (as they pretended) by the means of ſome Martyrs; wrote to *Cyprian* that they were now received by the Church, and deſired that they might be more fully reſtored by *Cyprian* and the Church with him: *Cyprian* took it ill that they ſhould write to him as from a Church, whereas they that had received them, nor they themſelves, were no Church; but in this had neglected the Authority of them who were truly the Church. In all this *Cyprian* ſaith nothing but what is according to the Principles of Presbyterians: if any ſhould pretend to receive Penitents, even tho' they were Elders in a Congregation, or Miniſters in a Presbytery, without the Moderator, without the Elders, or the Presbytery, *reſpectivè*; we ſhould blame them, for Uſurpation, and diſorderly Walking. And it is very obſervable, that *Cyprian* in this very Paſſage ſaith, that *Eccleſia in Epiſcopo & Clero, & omnibus ſtantibus eſt conſtituta*: then it is not the Biſhop who is the Church: what he ſaith of the Church as being built on the Biſhop, is already cleared: he ſaith indeed, *omnis actus Eccleſiæ per eoſdem præpoſitos gubernatur*: in which our Author ſheweth but little Skill, when he tranſlateth theſe words, *all her* (the Churches) *Affairs are ordered by them as the Chief Rulers*: where it ſhould be turned, *by the ſame who are ſet over her* (the Church:) and I think that it will not be denyed that Presbyters are *Præpoſiti*, and are ſet over the Church: he ſaith no more then, but *the Church is founded on the Biſhop*, that is, his ſound Doctrine,

ctrine, as was before explained, and her Affairs are ruled by the ſame *Præpoſiti*; that is, the Biſhops, and others having Eccleſiaſtical Authority with them: For Presbyters are the ſame with Biſhops in this; and that *Cyprian* meaneth ſo, may be gathered from his varying the word *Epiſcopus* into *Præpoſitus*. Again granting, that all the Acts of the Church are ruled by the Biſhop, this will not prove that they are ruled by him alone. His other Teſtimony out of what he calleth Epiſtle 43, is far leſs to his purpoſe; *Feliciſmus*, with his Faction (who formerly had oppoſed *Cyprian*'s Election to be Biſhop) in his retirement, not only without him, but without the Concurrence of the Presbytery, or Congregational Elderſhip, (I ſhall not determine which of theſe the Church of *Carthage* was then governed by) received ſome of the lapſed: which I, as well as my Antagoniſt do reckon a very diſorderly Action; this *Cyprian* doth juſtly blame: And that on this Ground, that they ſet up another Altar in that Church, that is, they threw off the Church Authority that was regularly placed in *Carthage*; and ſet up another beſide: we alſo would blame them who would caſt off the Authority of the Presbytery, or Kirk-Seſſion, and ſet up another. What is *Cyprian*'s meaning is yet clearer from what our Author unwarily citeth out of his Book *de unitate Eccleſiæ. An eſſe ſibi cum Chriſto videtur qui adverſus Chriſti Sacerdotes facit? Qui ſe à cleri ejus & Plebis ſocietate ſecernit?* Where he deſcribeth Schiſme to be when ſome depart from the Rulers and Members of the Church (not from the Biſhop alone) and that is to be underſtood, while they keep God's way.

§. 30. His third Prepoſition is, that *Cyprian maketh the contempt of one Biſhop, or undutifulneſs to him, the original of Schiſme.* I am ſo far from oppoſing him in this, that I think when people begin to quarrel with the meaneſt of Chriſts Miniſters, (unleſs his Life, or Doctrine, or Government, give juſt cauſe) that they ſin againſt God, contemn his Ordinance, and are on the brink of Schiſme; if not Hæreſie alſo: And I am ſure all that he citeth out out of *Cyprian* on this head, amounteth to no more except a word

Or

or two, which I shall a little consider. When he speaketh of one *Bishop*, I understand him of one *Præses*, whether in a Congregational, or Classical *Presbytrey*, and that in conjunction with them: who opposeth such Authority opposeth Christ's Institution. He mentioneth p. 23. as also p. 32. *The Bishops Monarchical power in the Church*; and maketh *Cyprian* prove it by the *Bees* who have a *King*, the Beasts who have a *Captain*, and *Robbers* who have a *Chiftain*. It is evident to any who consider *Cyprian*'s other Writings, that he never arrogated to himself a *Monarchical Power* over the Church; for he plainly disowneth it as we shall after have occasion to shew: But he is here dealing with one *Pupianus*, who had reproached *Cyprian* as proud and arrogant, here *Cyprian* defendeth himself, and retorteth the same Charge of Arrogance on *Pupianus* in that he took on him to arraign the Bishops and Rulers of the Church; and had denyed his power in the Church: and he sheweth what Inconveniency it were to the Church, if all this time the Church of *Carthage* had been governed by a Man who had no Authority: and in this he bringeth the similitude of the *Bees*, *&c.* Will any think that *Cyprian* was so weak as to take this for a sufficient Argument to prove *Monarchical Power* in the Church: he only bringeth it as a similitude to illustrate this Truth, that there must be a Government in the Church, and it had been ill with the Church of *Carthage*, if so long a time they had One over them who was no lawful Ruler: which is no Determination of the Extent of *Cyprian*'s power; Neither was that the Question between him and *Pupianus*.

§. 31. I proceed to his fourth Proposition, *p.* 24. *The Bishop was so much the principle of Unity; the people had such Dependence on him, and was so virtually in him, that what he did as Bishop, was reputed the Deed of the whole Church; which he ruled.* And to confirm this, he bringeth Instances, that *Churches were blamed for communicating with criminal Bishops, and that they did not separat from them; and are commended for the Bishops owning the Truth.* Had our Author thought fit to peruse and consider his Papers before

fore he printed them, it is like we ſhould not have been troubled with ſuch crude Notions. For 1. How can this be reconciled to what he had a little before-pleaded, concerning the horrid ſinfulneſs of ſeparating from their Biſhop; and this without any diſtinction or Limitation. 2. He is ſo unwiſe as to add one word that ſpoileth all his Deſign, *viz. As Biſhop*, for what a Biſhop acteth *as Biſhop*, he acteth in the Conſiſtory, or the Presbytery; and by the plurality of their Votes: and that is indeed the Fact of the Church *Repreſentative*, and of the Church *diffuſive* too, if they ſhew no diſlike of it; But this is no Semblance of Proof of the Power of Biſhops that he pleadeth for. *Cyprian*'s Rhetorical flouriſh in ſaying, that *when* Cornelius *confeſſed the Faith before the Perſecutors, the whole Roman Church confeſſed*; Is no more but that *Cornelius* gave a faithful Teſtimony to that Doctrine, that he had preached among that People, and that they received, and did ſtill owne; is this an Argument that *Cornelius* had the ſole Power of Church-Government in *Rome*. Yea, all this might have been ſaid of any Member of that Church who had ſo confeſſed, and the Church did not reclaim, but profeſſed the ſame Truth; It is far leſs probative, that *Cyprian deſired to ſuffer at* Carthage, *rather than elſe where, that he might in Confeſſion be the Mouth of them all.* And leaſt of all is it an Argument, that he calleth them *his Bowels, his Body, their Grief was his Grief, &c.* We muſt abandon all Senſe and Reaſon, if theſe paſs for concludent Arguments. Of the ſame weight is what he bringeth out of *Pontius, of the Bleſſedneſs of the people of* Carthage, *who ſuffered together with ſuch a Biſhop.* I beg the Readers pardon for troubling him with ſuch ſilly Arguments, which need no Anſwer.

§. 32. His fifth Propoſition, that *the Biſhops being the principle of Union to his Church, was held before the Cyprianick Age*: This, I ſay needeth no further Animadverſion: for it bringeth no new thing; Neither is it to be imagined that *Ignatius*, whom he citeth, meant that the ſole Authority of the Biſhop, rather than the Doctrine that he taught from the infallible Word of God, was the *Princi-*

ple

ple of Unity to the Church: Or, that they who belong to Christ are with the Bishop, whether he teacheth Truth or Error: It is a vast mistake that he saith, that *Cyprian, Ep.* 33. *pleadeth for the divine Right of Episcopacy in that Ep.* (which is (*mihi*) 27) he pleadeth for the Divine Authority of the Church, and her Bishops; that is, Pastours: not for a Divine Warrant for the Prælation of some of them above others: nothing can be more evident than the concurrent Testimonies of Antiquity against this Fancy: Scripture, and the most Antient of the Fathers speak of Bishops and Presbyters indistinctly; when the Distinction began to be taken notice of, *Jerome* saith that it was brought in by the Presbyters themselves: *Ep. ad Evagr.* as also on *Tit.* and *Aug. Ep.* 10. referreth to *Ecclesiæ usus*.. Yea, *Concil. Nic.* 1. *Can.* 6. maketh the Distinction of Bishops, as Metropolitans, *&c.* To be *mos antiquus*: All that followeth, §. 37, 37, 36. doth also confute this Opinion. But this I insist not on, because our Author hath put off the proof of that Divine Institution of Episcopacy, to his next Essay, p. 94. His sixth and last Proposition is, that *the Principle of the Bishops being the Center of Unity is most reasonable and accountable in it self.* We may now expect some *Herculean* Argument, and the highest Effort of his Skill: And I am willing that the whole Controversie be hanged on this Pin. All that he bringeth for Argument is, *every particular Church is an Organical, political Body; and there can be no Organical Body without a* Principle *of Unity, on which all the Members must hang, and from which being separated, they must cease to be Members; and who so fit for being* Principle *of Unity to a Church as he who is* Pastour, Ruler, Governour, Captain, Head, Judge, *Christs Vicar, &c.* Not his Conclusion only, but an Assumption is understood, *viz. the Bishop is all this*, ergo *he is the Center of Unity*; and his *quod erat demonstrandum* followeth a little after, *it is scarce possible to prove any thing of this nature more demonstratively.* One might make sport with this Argument, which is introduced, and backed with such Parade: But I am in earnest in this Debate. There are here no less than

three Premiſſes expreſſed, and a fourth neceſſarily underſtood, before we can reach the Concluſion; which every Logician will condemn; and when we are at laſt, through all theſe Stages, arived at the Concluſion, it is above diſtinguiſhed, and his Argument can reach no more than is by us confeſſed: Beſides this, it is hard to ſhew how theſe his Premiſſes hang together, or what Connection they have. Further, that the *principle of Unity* in a political Body is one perſon and cannot be a Society, the Conſiſtory, or the Presbytery in the Church, will hardly be proved: by this Argument there can be no Unity in a Common-wealth, but only in Monarchy, Ariſtocracy, and Democracy in a Nation are here not only made unlawful, but impoſſible. that the Biſhop is fitteſt to be the Principle of Unity in the Church is *gratis dictum*: Yea, it is τὸ πρωτομένον: Notwithſtanding of the metaphorical Appellations that our Author giveth him, from ſome of the Antients. Yea, if a Society cannot be the Center of Unity in a particular Church, who ſhall be the Center of Unity among Biſhops; we muſt ſurely have the *Pope* for this uſe, which is indeed the native concluſion of our Author's Argument that he braggeth ſo much of. But this will afterward occurre.

§. 33. He cometh now (*p.* 27.) to another Argument: *a Biſhop in Cyprian's age, was ſupreme in his Church, immediatly ſubject to Chriſt, had no Eccleſiaſtical Superior on Earth: the Church was one, but divided into many Precincts, each had its Biſhop who was their Supreme.* I am no further concerned in what he ſaith on this head; but what he bringeth for the Biſhops Supremacy. Wherefore I inſiſt not on his firſt Propoſition, concerning the Equality of Biſhops; I only obſerve that he is for Parity in the Church; and if it be found among Biſhops, I know no Scripture nor Reaſon that condemneth it among Presbyters. To the ſame purpoſe is his ſecond Prepoſition, and his Third, all which are levelled againſt the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*; whoſe cauſe I do not intend to plead. Wherefore I come to examine his 4*th* Propoſition, p. 31. *by the Principles of theſe times, every Biſhop was Chriſts Vicar*

Vicar, within his own Diſtrict: So, ſay I, is every Miniſter of the Goſpel; underſtanding by Vicar, one who deriveth his Power from Chriſt, and to him muſt give account of it. He ſaith further, that *a Biſhop had a Primacy in his own Church*. If he mean that he was *primus Presbyter*; I denyed it not, if *that he had the ſole Power in his own perſon*, or that the Presbyters had not a coordinate power with him in the Government of the Church, I deny it. Neither is it proved by *Cyprian*'s words, which he citeth; *Cathedram ſibi conſtituere, & primatum aſſumere*: which I cannot find by what Directions he giveth, and therefore cannot tell what might be further ſaid for vindicating them. The next Expreſſion admiteth of the ſame Anſwer, *viz.* that *he managed the Ballance of Government*; it is not ſaid that he did this by himſelf; Our Moderator *manageth the Ballance of Government*, but with the Presbytery. The *ſublime Sacerdotii faſtigum*, ſignifieth no more than *primus Presbyter*: The Antients uſe as big words for as low things: neither do I know any higher Degree in thoſe days: If my Antagoniſt will prove it, he muſt uſe other Topicks, than words that may admit various ſignifications. the ſame I ſay of the Expreſſions that follow, the *vigor Epiſcopatus, the ſublimis & divina poteſtas gubernandæ Eccleſiæ*; This laſt may agree to the meaneſt Member of a Presbytery; Are not Presbyters called by *Cyprian* ſuch as are *divino ſacerdotio honorati*: and *glorioſi ſacerdotes* as himſelf citeth. p. 7. To what purpoſe he citeth *Jerome* for the Parity of Biſhops, and ſaith that *I* will not reject his Teſtimony, I underſtand not. I ſhall neither oppoſe him nor *Jerome* in that Principle.

§. 34. He bringeth another Argument, (p. 32.) from *the High Prieſt among the* Jews, and ſaith, that *a Biſhop was the ſame to Chriſtians, that he was to the* Jews. I ſee the learned Author is very unhappy in ſtumbling upon popiſh Arguments, and he can ſay litle for his Biſhop, but what they ſay for their *Pope*: And it is evident, that the Papiſts from this *Medium*, argue with much more ſhew of Reaſon: For the *High Prieſt* had univerſal ſupream Authority over the univerſal Church, that then was; The Papiſts

infer the *Pope*'s univerſal Head-ſhip: tho' I am far from thinking this Argument concludent for them; yet what ſhew of Conſequence can it have for a Biſhops Power in his Dioceſs? Or with what Face can this Author ſay, that a Biſhop is the ſame to Preſbyters and Deacons, that he was to the *Levites*, unleſs he ſay that a Biſhop was the ſame to all the Presbyters and Deacons in the World: that the *High Prieſt* was to all the *Levites* in the world. *Cyprian*'s Reaſons, brought from the *High Prieſt*, have much more Senſe in them than theſe of our Author: For he pleadeth no more from that Topick, but that as the *High Prieſt* was to be obyed, and not reſiſted, ſo is the Biſhop. As the *High Prieſt* was reverenced, even by Chriſt, ſo is the Biſhop; we ſay the ſame: that a Biſhop acting in his Sphere, with his Conſiſtory, or Presbytery, ſhould be obeyed and reſpected: and we count it the ſame ſort of Sin in Schiſmaticks, who rebel againſt this Church Authority, with *Kora*'s Rebellion againſt *Aaron*: but it is utterly inconſequential to infer Church Monarchy from *Aaron*'s Power. I wiſh he had brought any thing that might look like proof of this conſequence. He ſaith, p. 34. that the Chriſtian Hierarchie was copied from that of the *Jews*; and he bringeth Arguments for it, ſuch as they are, one is from the Names, *Prieſt*, *Prieſthood*, *Altar*, *Sacrafice*, *&c.* which he calleth a *pregnant Argument*; I cannot but ſtill obſerve how much the *Papiſts* owe him; not only for their *Pope*, but for their *unbloody Sacrifice*, what? muſt we have all that of the Old Teſtament whereof we retain the Names? If ſo, we muſt have a new Goſpel. This Argument is eaſily delivered of its *Pregnancy*, by denying the Conſequence. His other Argument is from an *Ep. of Clement of Rome*, who lived in the Apoſtles times: wherein he exhorteth to Order, and every ones keeping his Station, and then reckoneth up ſeveral Subordinations under the Old Teſtament. *A. Clement* uſeth the Old Teſtament hierarchy as a *ſimile*, to illuſtrate New Teſtament Subordination of Officers in the Church; *ergo* we muſt have the ſame Officers, and they muſt have the ſame Power that theſe had, *non ſequitur*:

Neither

Neither was ſuch a Conſequence intended by *Clement*: For a ſecond Anſwer, our Author may know that that, and others of the Epiſtles that go under *Clement's* name are rejected, as none of his, by Learned Men, and on ſolid Grounds.

§. 35. He hath a long Diſcourſe, beginning *p.* 34. at the end, to ſhew that my Definition of a Biſhop, is conſiſtent with none of the three Principles laſt mentioned, which were current in the *Cyprianick Age*; much leſs with all three together. I have already ſhewed, how far theſe Principles were held in that Age; and how our Notion of a Biſhop agreeth with them all. What ſeemeth to be further Argumentative in this Harangue, I ſhall conſider. He ſaith *the Biſhops being the Principle of Unity, doth not conſiſt with his being a ſingle* Presbyter; *where there were fourty ſix Presbyters; as at* Rome: *there would rather be fourty ſix Principles of Diviſions, and make the Church a Monſter with fourty ſix Heads. Anſw.* 1. I retort this Argument: In the *firſt Council of Nice*, (for Example) where were three hundred Biſhops, what was the Principle of Unity? or, were they three hundred Principles of Diviſion? And a Church Meeting, or a Church Repreſentative, that was ſo Monſtrous as to have three hundred Heads? What he will anſwer in the one caſe, I will anſwer in the other. And indeed this Argument deſtroyeth the Parity of Biſhops, which he pleadeth for, as well as of Presbyters; and its Native Concluſion is, we muſt either have the *Papacy* over the Church, or *Anarchy* in it. *A.* 2. Where there are many ſuch Presbyters as our Author pleadeth for, we ſay the Biſhop was the προεδρος, and not a ſingle Presbyter. *A.* 3. In a particular Flock, where are many Ruling, but not Teaching Presbyters, the Biſhop or Miniſter, is ſuch a *Principle of Unity*, as I have above owned: and where there are more Biſhops in one Church, the Principle of Unity, is their Teaching the ſame Doctrine: as is above explained. He next alledgeth, that *a Moderator cannot be the Principle of Unity in a Presbytery; ſeing as ſuch, he is neither Paſtor, Governour, nor Chriſtian; but may be a Heathen. A.* This wild Noti-

on

on, that a Heathen may be Moderator in a Presbytery, I have fully refuted, §. 8. To the firſt part of his Argument, I ſay, that not the Moderator alone, but with the Presbytery, is the *Principle of Unity*, while they all Teach the ſame Truths, and adhere to the one Rule of our Faith, and Practice, the Word of God: any other Bond, or Cement, by which Men can be United, which lyeth in the Authority of a Man, rather than in the true Doctrine, is an Antichriſtian Fancy; and tendeth to enſlave the Conſcience to the Will of Man. We know no ſuch Uniting Head as he telleth of, but Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 4. 15, 16. Neither did ever *Cyprian* dream of ſuch a Head of the Church Next he will make our Notion of a Biſhop inconſiſtent with his other Principls, *the Biſhop's Supremacy, and Independency.* I have already ſhewed, that the Church in *Cyprian's* Time, knew no ſuch *Supremacy, nor Independency*: but held, and Practiſed a Subordination, not of many to one, but of every one to the Collective Body, and of every leſſer Body to the greater, of which it was a part. I ſee no Reaſon nor Scripture Ground for *Independency*, whether of ſingle Paſtors and Congregations, or of Presbyteries, or of Biſhops; and their Provincial Synods. His third Principle, the Hierarchy under the Goſpel, being the ſame with that under the Old Teſtament, I have refuted, as a groundleſs Fancy; and therefore am under no Obligation to ſhew the Conſiſtency of our Parity with it.

§. 36. From *p.* 37. he layeth down Principles that would afford ſtronger, and more pertinent Arguments, than any we have yet met with, if he can but ſufficiently eſtabliſh theſe Principles. He mentioneth three, *viz.* 1. *The Biſhop's ſole Power in many Acts of Government and Diſcipline.* 2. *His Negative in all.* 3. *That all Presbyters were ſubject to his Authority and Juriſdiction.* If all this be true, our Cauſe is loſt: but we are not afraid to try it with him, through his help whoſe Cauſe we plead. Before I engage in this Debate with him, I deſire the Reader will reflect on what I obſerved, §. 10. that if we can bring Teſtimonies to prove

a Parity of Power among Presbyters: and that Domination over them by one, was condemned, or disowned in *Cyprian's* Time; his bringing Testimonies to the contrary, will not be found Concludent: for Contradictory Assertions derogate from the Authority of the Asserter: or seeming Contradictions must be reconciled by a fair Exposition: or, such Testimonies will prove, that the Practice and Principles of the Churches of that Age, were not Uniform; any of which would weaken his Cause. I shall not here repeat the Citations that are full to this purpose, which I have on diverse Occasions mentioned. Nor need I confine my self to *Cyprian's* Age alone: seing our Author pretendeth to no less Antiquity for his Way, than from the Apostles down ward; yea, all the Ages of the Church; and all the Churches of every Age: and we acknowledge that after the third Century, Church-Government was much altered to the worse. I shall begin with *Ignatius*, both because his Testimony is *Argumentum ad Hominem*, at least, seing my Antagonist, and his Party, lay so much Stress on his Epistles: also, because if he speak for Parity, it may abate the force of all that they bring out of his Writings to the contrary. What I shall alledge from him, I find cited by the famous Arch-Bishop *Usher*, in his *Original of Bishops and Metropolitans*, *Ignat. Ep. ad Trallianos.* τῷ ἐπισκοπῷ, &c. *be subject to the Bishop as to the Lord*; and after, *be subject to the Presbytery as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope.* Also ὁ χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκοπέ, &c. *he that doth any thing without the Bishop, and the Presbyters, and the Deacons, such an one is defiled in Conscience.* And again ἐρρώσθε, &c. *farewel in Christ Jesus, being subject to the Bishop, and also to the Presbyters.* Here it is plain that Church Authority, to which the People must be subject, is not given to the Bishop alone, but to the Presbytery also; and indeed to them both acting conjunctly. I need not transcribe what is, with much plainness, cited to our purpose, by *Blondel*; out of both the *Clements*, *Polycarpus*, *Justin*; and others of the first of the Fathers. I only mention *Clem. Alexand. Strom. Lib. 7. Penes Presbyteros est Disciplina*

quæ

quæ facit homines meliores. *Tertullian Apolog.* C. 39. *Præsident probati quique Seniores.* *Viz.* In their Meetings for Discipline: where were *Admonitiones, Castigationes, & Censuræ Divinæ.* He is speaking of the Discipline of a Congregation; and ascribeth the Government of it to a Community, not to a single person. The Clergy of *Rome* in their Epistles to *Cyprian*, (which is *Ep.* 31.) do plainly declare their Opinion about the receiving the Lapsed; that it should be done *collatione Consiliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, Confessoribus, & stantibus Laicis*: this they mean of the general Method that should be laid down for it; it should be Advised about by as many as can give Counsel: but when they speak of the Authoritative Sentence; they say, it should not be done *ab uno*: then not by a Bishop acting by sole Authority. *Cypr. Ep.* 10. §. 3. Writing to the Clergy of *Carthage*, and shewing the evil of overturning Church Discipline, as had been done by some of their number; he telleth them, *Erunt rei qui præsunt, & hæc fratribus non suggerunt, ut instructi à præpositis faciant omnia cum Dei timore.* Where it is evident that they owned them as *præpositi*; and charge on them the Duty of giving faithful Warning, according to that their Character: whence it followeth that he did not look on himself as being the only *præpositus*, or Ruler of that Church. And *Ep.* 28. he commendeth the Clergy of *Carthage*, (while himself was absent from them) that they had debarred from Communicating with them *Gaius Presbyter Diddensis*, and his Deacon, who had Communicated with the *Lapsed*: and he telleth them that they had Acted like Men of Integrity, and according to the Discipline of the Church: *integre & cum Disciplina feciſtis.* If he had the sole Power, this Fact of theirs had been quite contrary to Church Discipline. If any say, that they did this with the Advice of some of *Cyprian's Collegues*, that is, Bishops. *A.* Whether these were Bishops or not, we know not: but they only gave Advice, the Authoritative Act was by the Clergy of *Carthage.* *Ep.* 55. §. 17. *Cyprian* compareth the number of Presbyters and Deacons who had concurred

curred in condemning (*affuerunt judicio & cognitioni*) ſome Schiſmaticks ; with the number of them that ſtood for them : which is a clear Argument that the Clergy, with the Biſhop, not onely conſulted, but judicially determined, in Church Affairs. And in the ſame *Epiſt.* §. 21. ſpeaking to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, he expreſly mentioneth the Clergy as ruling the Church with *Cornelius* : his Words are, *Florentiſſimo clero illic tecum præſidenti.* Alſo *Epiſt.* 58. he hath Words of the like importance, §. 2. *Qui cum Epiſcopo Presbyteri ſacerdotali honore conjuncti.* It is alſo evident in many of *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles, that he divideth the Clergy in *Præpoſitos* (which Word doth manifeſtly ſignifie Rulers) and Deacons. So *Epiſt.* 62, 65. and elſewhere. I only add out of *Cyprian Epiſt.* 6. §. 4. *Doleo enim quando audio —— nec à Diaconis aut Presbyteris regi poſſe.* *Pamelius's* Note on this Paſſage maketh it yet more plain for us ; tho' he was a Papiſt, and no Presbyterian. *Hinc* (ſaith he) *non obſcurè colligitur, viguiſſe adhuc Carthagini, ætate auctoris, prærogativam Presbyterorum & Diaconorum primitivæ Eccleſiæ ; quæ communi totius Presbyterii*, i. e. *Presbyterorum & Diaconorum collegii, conſilio, adminiſtrabantur omnia ab Epiſcopis* : And he citeth to confirm this, *Ignatius*, as I have before cited him. If any ſay *Pamelius* attributeth to the Presbytery but *Conſilium* ; it is plain that *Cyprian* ſpeaketh of their Ruling Power.

§. 37. Contemporary with *Cyprian* was *Firmilianus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* ; who doth fully declare for Presbyterial Government, in his *Epiſt. to Cyprian*, which is the 75. of *Ep. Cypr.* for §. 3. he hath theſe Words, *Qua ex re neceſſario apud nos fit ; ut per ſingulos annos ſeniores & præpoſiti in unum conveniamus ; ad diſponenda ea quæ curæ noſtræ commiſſa ſunt ; ut ſi quæ graviora ſunt, communi conſilio dirigantur.* And §. 6. *Omnis poteſtas & gratia in Eccleſia eſt conſtituta, ubi præſident majores natu* (πρεσβύτεροι) *qui & baptizandi, & manum imponendi & ordinandi poſſident poteſtatem.* It is to be obſerved, that frequent mention is made in this Epiſtle of *Epiſcopi*, Biſhops, and *Pamelius* thinketh that this *Ep.* being turned out of Greek into Latine by *Cyprian*, to whom

it was written, by *Præpositus* is meant Bishop, and by *Senior* Presbyter, whence it is evident, that here all Church Power is ascribed to the Presbyter that is given to the *Præpositus* or Bishop. At the same time was *Pontius* one of *Cyprian*'s Deacons, and his constant Attendant, and who well knew his Principles; he wrote *Cyprian*'s Life, and in that History he hath these Words, *Nulla mora, nulla dilatio Presbyterium & Sacerdotum statum* (that is presently after his Conversion to Christianity) *accepit*: *quis enim non omnes honorum gradus crederet tali menti*: where it is plain that *Pontius* thought that all Church Degrees were included in *Sacerdotium & Presbyterium*; which he taketh for one. And a little below he joineth *Sacerdotium & Episcopatus* as the same Office that *Cyprian* was chosen to, while he was *Neophytus*, and as was thought *Novellus*. From all this it appeareth that *Cyprian* was made Priest, Presbyter and Bishop all at once, as being the same thing. *Gregor. Nazianz.* (who flourished in the fourth Century) in his *Apology*, telleth us of *the Apostles making Canons for Bishops and Presbyters*, 1 Tim. 3. *and* Tit. 1. *Whether their Office may be called a Ministry, or Rule of Government*; his Words are εἴτε λειτουργίαν χρὴ λέγειν εἴτε ἡγεμονίαν. He saith likewise of them, that *they* (*by their promotion to be* Presbyters) *ascend from being ruled to be Rulers*: *that they have Authority, not over a Flock*; *but over mens Souls*: and other very sublime Powers he ascribeth to them. And in his Orations, he is as profuse in extolling the Dignity and Authority of Presbyters, as any other in exalting Bishops. He saith, *as many as are ordain'd, are chosen to the high Thrones of* Presbytery πρεσβυτερίᾳ. That he speaketh not of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters, is plain, for the design of his Discourse, especially in his *Apology*, is to shew how the Apostle directed Bishops and Presbyters by the same Canons, without distinguishing them, or their work; and that *onely custom had raised the Bishop above them as their* Præses.

§. 38. I next bring *Ambrose* as a Witnes for us; in his *Epistle to Syagrius*, he sheweth, that *when he and* Syagrius *had severally passed Sentence on a Delinquent, the Church was unsatisfied with the Sentence of*

of Syagrius, and gave the reaſon, *becauſe he had done it by himſelf, ſine alicujus fratris conſenſu*; but *acquieſced in the Sentence paſſed by Ambroſe*, becauſe (ſaith he) *hoc Judicium noſtrum cum Fratribus & Con-Sacerdotibus participatum proceſſit.* Whence it is plain to have been the Principle of thoſe days, that the Biſhop had not ſole Juriſdiction: however ſome were then Graſping at it. *Chryſoſtom. Homil.* 11. *in* 1. *Tim.* τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τάγμα ἀφεὶς, &c. *omitting the Order of Presbyters, he* (the Apoſtle) *paſſeth to the Deacons. Why ſo? Becauſe there is no great Difference: for they are Ordained for Teaching and Governing* (προεσίαν) *the Church*; and what he had ſaid of Biſhops, he applyeth to the Presbyters. If then *Chryſoſtom* was for the Biſhop's ſole Juriſdiction, let any judge. *Auguſt. Ep.* 19. *quanquam ſecundum honorum vocabula quæ jam Eccleſiæ uſus obtinuit, Epiſcopatus Presbyterio major ſit, tamen in multis rebus Auguſtinus Hieronymo minor eſt.* Where it may be obſerved, to our purpoſe, 1. That *Auguſtine* placeth the Prælation of a Biſhop above a Presbyter, in the Title of Dignity, but ſpeaketh not a word of Superior Power. 2. He not only inſinuateth, that that Difference (ſuch as it was) had its Original, not from Divine Inſtitution, but Humane Cuſtom; but he ſpeaketh of it as lately ſetled, *jam obtinuit*: this was after 420 years: it was neither conſtant, nor univerſal, till then. *Salvianus* maketh the *Levitæ & Sacerdotes* to be the Apoſtles Succeſſors; not mentioning Biſhops as diſtinct. So *Gildas* frequently ſpeaketh of Biſhops and Presbyters promiſcuouſly. I hope I may alſo adduce *Jerom*, a Presbyter, as a Witneſs, as well as they do other Fathers who were Biſhops. He giveth all manner of Church Power to Presbyters, and not to Biſhops only. *Ep. ad Heliodorum. Presbytero* (ſaith he) *ſi peccavero, licet me tradere Satanæ in interitum carnis. Et Ep. ad Demetrium*; *ſunt quos Eccleſia reprehendit, quos interdum abjicit, in quos nonnunquam Epiſcoporum & Presbyterorum Cenſura deſævit. Ambroſe* giveth Account, *Ep.* 80. of the Excommunication of *Jovinianus*, and others with him, by *Syricius* Biſhop of *Rome*; whoſe words to *Ambroſe* were, *omnium noſtrum tam Presbyterorum*,

quam Diaconorum, quam totius Cleri ſciſſitata fuit Sententia. It is ſhewed, §. 37. that Penitents were to be received by the Biſhop and Clergy; as *Cypr. Ep.* 12. it were then ſtrange, if they were caſt out by the Biſhop alone. I deſire the Reader (who can) for further ſatisfaction, would read *Paul Baynes Dioceſan's Trial*: and Mr. *Peregrin Letters Patents of Presbytery*: they having ſomewhat that is ſingular on this Subject.

§. 39. Let us now examine what he is pleaſed to bring for the Biſhop's ſole Power in the Church; and againſt the Parity that we have Aſſerted. And firſt, I ſhall examine his three Principles above-mentioned. The firſt of which is, *there were ſeveral conſiderable Acts of Power, belonging to the Government and Diſcipline of the Church, which belonged ſolely to the Biſhop; ſeveral Powers Lodged in his Perſon, which he could manage by himſelf, and without the Concurrence of any other Church-Governour.* Of this ſort he reckoneth eight, *viz. Confirmation, Ordination, Settling Presbyters, Diſpoſal of Church Revenues, Impoſing Charitable Contributions, Convocating the Presbyters and Deacons, Indicting Publick Faſts, Delegating two of his Presbyters.* Theſe I ſhall conſider diſtinctly, with his Proofs for what he Aſſerteth about them. For the firſt of theſe, *Confirmation* of the *Adult*, who had in their Infancy been Baptized; at firſt it was no more, but after diligent Inſtructing them in the Grounds of Religion, bringing them to the Paſtor of the Church, (and probably before the Elderſhip) that they might be tryed in their Proficiency, and ſo declared fit to receive the Lord's Supper: in which nothing can be blamed. Afterward it came to be more Theatrically managed, and *Impoſition of Hands* was the Ceremony by which it was ſet off: till at laſt it came to be eſteemed a *Sacrament*. Now when it was thus turned from the Simplicity of God's Ordinance, to be a Pompous Device of Man, (not a few of which were crept into the Church in, yea before *Cyprian*'s Age) it is not ſtrange, if they committed not the managing of it to all, to whom Chriſt had committed his Ordinances; but to one of their own chuſing. Our Debate

is,

is, whether the Bishop had sole Power of managing any of Christ's Ordinances; of which number this is not. Yet I find litle strength in our Author's Arguments for this Power in the Bishop. His first Proof is, *Cypr. Ep. ad Jubajanum, it was the Custom to offer such as were Baptized to the Bishops, that by their Prayers, and the Laying on of their Hands, they might receive the Holy Ghost, and be Consummated by the Sign of our Lord:* which our Author taketh to be *the Sign of the Cross.* Here *Cyprian* useth the word *Præpositis*, which our Author is pleased to translate Bishops; whereas Presbyters also were called by that Name. For *Cyprian, Ep.* 3. §. 1. the *Roman* Clergy, (when they had no Bishop,) said of themselves, that *it appeared that they were Præpositi*; and thence inferred, that *it was incumbent on them to take Care of the Flock:* and they speak of idle Shepherds as *neglegentes Præpositi*, whose Reproof was to be a Warning to them. And *Cypr. Ep. and Jubajan.* which is 69. §. 4. plainly calleth the Successors of the seventy Disciples, as well as these of the Apostles, *Præpositos*: for of them that place *Luc.* 10. 16. which he citeth, is to be understood. And *Ep.* 62. §. 1. he sheweth how Church Discipline is to be regarded, *à Præpositis & Plebe.* And *Ep.* 65. §. 4. he mentioneth *Episcopos & Præpositos*, as distinct. And *Ep.* 21. which is *Celerini ad Lucium*, §. 3. *quorum jam causa audita, præceperunt eos Præpositi sic esse donec Episcopus constituatur.* And *de Lapsis*, §. 4. *Præpositos superbo tumore contemnere*: it is spoken of all the Rulers of the Church. For a further Refutation of this his Principle, it may be observed, that this *Confirmation*, of which *Cyprian* here speaketh, is not that which in our days goeth under that Name; but that used in the Apostolick Church, the Effect of which, was the giving of the *Holy Ghost*; as is clear from his citing *Act.* 8. 14, *&c* for the Pattern of what they did, and their Warrant for it. Now that *Imposition of Hands* was not given to all the Baptized; but only to such as were *ad ministerium ordinandi*, saith *Lightfoot*: it was not *ad sanctificationem, sed ad dona extraordinaria*; saith the same Author. *Piscator, Beza, Grotius*, do also so expound this place: wherefore

wherefore it proveth nothing, except our Author can tell us what *Cyprian* meant by it: which I can not; seing the extraordinary Gifts of the *Holy Ghost* were then ceased, for any thing that we know. His next Citation, out of *Firmilian*, destroyeth what it is brought for; for he ascribeth to Bishops the Power of *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, *Ordination*: his Word is, they *posses* this Power: I hope he will not say that Presbyters had no Power in Baptism: wherefore by Bishops here *Firmilian* must mean the Pastors of the Church; all of whom were frequently called Bishops at that time: yea, himself confesseth, that these spoken of, were the *majores natu*, whom he most absurdly pleadeth to be Bishops, as distinct from preaching Presbyters. Of as little weight is what *Cornelius* saith of *Novatianus* (*Eusebius* maketh *Cornelius* say this of *Novatus*, chap. 42.) that he was not confirmed by the Bishop; for in that place *Cornelius* questioned not only the Confirmation of *Novatus*, but his Baptism: and that he speaketh not of the ordinary Confirmation, but of that which belonged to Priests, is clear; for he saith, *how then came he by the Holy Ghost?* and he is there pleading his incapacity to be a Bishop, on that account. But of this too much: for it doth not hurt our Cause if it be granted that Bishops then were so far distinguished from other Presbyters, that they usurped a Power which our Lord had not given to them, nor any man else, at that time; what ever he had before done to them whom he immediatly sent, and extraordinarly endowed.

§. 40. The second Act of Power that he ascribeth to the *Cyprianick* Bishop alone is, *He had the sole Power of Ordination; and that of whatsoever Clergy-men within his District. Ordinations could not be performed without him: but he could perform them regularly without the concurrence of any other Church-Officer*: And he saith, *this hath so frequently and fully been proved by learned men, that he need insist little on it.* All which we deny: neither do I find any Argument here brought by him, nor have *I* found in the Writings of his learned men (and I may, without vanity, say, I have seen the strongest of them) which might be a rational ground

ground of Conviction. Before I examine his Proofs for this Assertion, I shall prove the *Antithesis*: That Presbyters did, in that age, and before, joyn in the Ordination of Presbyters. And first, it is evident from *Jerom*'s words, so much insisted upon by our Episcopal Brethren, *Alexandriæ, a Marco evangelista usq; ad Heracleam & Dionysium Espiscopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant.* Whence it may fairly be deduced, that till *An. Christi* 246, all the Power or Authority that the Bishop had, was given him by the Presbyters; they elected him, nor had he any other Ordinatiou, or Communication of Power, but what he had from them; in the Opinion of *Jerome*. If then the Presbyters made a Bishop; it could not be he alone, but the Bishop with them, and as one of them who made Presbyters. 2. *Hilarius*, who lived in the midle of the fourth Century, in *Eph.* 4. hath these words, *apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignaverunt, si præsens non fuit Episcopus.* Whether ye interpret *Consignaverunt* of *Confirmation*, as some, or *Consecration* of Church-Officers, as others, it cometh to the same Conclusion: seing our Author and his Complices, reserve both these Powers to the Bishop; and it is probable they were not divided. That they did it *absente Episcopo*, doth imply that they had that Authority, for without it they could not have done it at all. 3. *Novatus* a Presbyter in *Carthage*, while *Cyprian* was Bishop: Ordained *Felicissimus*: This Ordination (tho' no doubt it was irregular, being done without the Moderator and the Presbytery) yet it was not lookt on as null, but *Novatus* was, after that, owned by *Cyprian*: and *Felicissimus* continued to be a Deacon. To this our Author answereth p. 42. that *not Novatus, but neighbouring Bishops by the procurement of Novatus, did it.* But *Cyprian*'s words are plain; *Felicissimum diaconum sua factione constituit.* That this Deacon was ordained by Bishops is *gratis dictum*. I have also elsewhere proved, that in *Scotland* there were Presbyters ruling the Church, long before they had Bishops: which could not be if none but Bishops could Ordain them.

§ 41.

§. 41. *Cyprian Ep.* (*mihi*) 33. *in ordinationibus clericis, ſolemus vos ante conſulere, ut mores & merita ſingulorum communi conſilio ponderarem*, &c. In that *Ep.* he telleth the Church what was his uſual practice; and we have cauſe to think that he lookt on it as his Duty not to Ordain without the Presbyters: *Commune conſilium* here can import no leſs than Deliberation and Authoritative Deciſion, for it was common to him and them. In the following part of the Epiſtle, he excuſeth his Ordaining *Aurelius* a *Lector*, without them, from the evidence of a Divine Call: and the preſent Diſtreſs and Scattering of the Church might excuſe this neceſſary diverting from the common Road: yet he telleth them, he did not this by himſelf, but *hunc igitur fratres dilectiſſimi, à me & à collegis qui præſentes aderant ordinatum ſciatis; quod vos ſcio & libenter amplecti, & optare tales in Eccleſia noſtra quem plurimos ordinari.* He maketh the like Excuſe, *Ep.* 24. for his Ordaining *Saturus* a *Lector* and *Optatus* a *Sub-deacon*: only here he had before hand the common conſent; but his Circumſtances (being in his Retirement) did not ſuffer this to be done in and with the Presbytery; but that he did it not alone, we may gather from the former inſtance. This doth ſufficiently ſhew that Ordinations were not performed without the Determination of the Presbytery. But it is alſo manifeſt, that in the ſolemnizing of them, by impoſition of Hands, the Presbyters had their Share with the Biſhop. *Cypr. Ep.* 10. §. 2. There is mention of *impoſitio manum Epiſcopi & cleri*, and that two ſeveral times. If it be ſaid, that this *Impoſition of Hands* was for abſolving Penitents; the conſeqnence is good from the one to the other, ſeing our Author joyneth *Confirmation* in order to Communion (of which this is a ſort) with *Ordination*, as two Powers reſerved to the Biſhop alone. *Ep.* 67. §. 4. he ſaith of *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, that he was ordained *Suffragio Cleri & Plebis*, *Concil. Carthag.* 3. *Canon.* 22. *Nullus ordinetur clericus non probatus, vel Epiſcoporum* (not Epiſcopi) *examine, vel populi teſtimonio. Concil. Carthag.* 4. *Can.* 3. *Presbyter cum ordinatur; Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente,*

te,

te, etiam omnes presbyteri qui adſunt manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput ejus teneant. This is exactly our practice, if ye allow the Moderator to be the *Cyprianick Epiſcopus*. Our Author himſelf ſeemeth to inſinuat, that the Presbyters with *Cyprian*, uſed to concur in Ordination; while he premiſeth to his proofs for *ſole Ordination*, that paſſage out of Ep. 14. (as he quoteth it) *a primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatueram nihil ſine conſilio veſtro & ſine conſenſu plebis, mea privatim ſententia gerere.* I ſay, if this be not meant of *Ordination*, it is here very impertinently brought in. Nor can his Comment on *Cyprian*'s words help him, *viz.* That *this was his voluntary Condeſcendence, that he was not bound to*: To prove which he putteth *Statueram* in *majuſculis* as if it were not uſual with good men when they enter on an Office, to reſolve to keep within the bounds of their power; to manage it lawfully; as well as to cede in what is their Right. But that *Cyprian*'s words cannot bear that ſenſe, I prove by the Reaſon he giveth; *ſic mutuus honor expoſcit*: the *mutuus honor* muſt be that due regard that he had to their Authority in the Church, and they ought to have to his: it had been a diſhonouring of them, and ſetting them lower than Chriſt had ſet them in his Church, for him to mannage her Affairs without them. And *Ep.* 18. he maketh this Matter yet clearer; *Quæ res, cum omnium noſtrum conſilium & ſententiam ſpectet, præjudicare ego, & ſoli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo.* Where it is manifeſt, that it was conſcience of Duty, and not good Nature onely, that induced him to this Conduct. Alſo that he attributeth to Presbyters not *conſilium* onely, but *ſententiam*; not onely a *conſultative Power*, but alſo *definitive*, or *deciſive*. The Apoſtle who had indeed a *ſole Juriſdiction*, ſpake in another Dialect, 1 *Cor.* 5. *I have judged already*. *Cyprian* durſt not do ſo, becauſe he knew he had not that *ſole Power*.

§. 42. Let us now hear his Proofs for the Biſhop's *ſole Power of Ordination*. The firſt is, What is ſaid of the *Ordination* of *Aurelius*, which I have already ſhewed to be againſt him. Wherefore I ſhall onely take notice of his Obſerves on this Paſſage, by which

he would force it to ſpeak for him. 1. That *his Power was the ſame in all Ordinations.* I ſhall not much contend about this: only, if they put the Power of *Ordaining* Officers of their own deviſing into the hands of whom they would; it doth not thence follow that they might, or did ſo diſpoſe of *Ordaining Power* with reſpect to theſe whom God had appointed, and about whoſe *Ordination* he had given Rules in the Word. 2. *He uſed only to ask their Counſel about the manners and Merits of the perſon to be Ordained; not their concurrence in the Act of Ordination.* This is a Miſtake, he asked not their Counſel only, but their joynt Suffrage, as is above ſhewed. That their Concurrence in the Act of *Ordination* is not here mentioned, is not to his purpoſe; ſeing it is conſequential to their Office, and Church Power. That *it is fairly imported in the inſtance of* Aurelius *that they uſed not to concur*, is a groundleſs Imagination; For this is a ſingle Inſtance in an extraordinary caſe, and he ſpendeth a whole Epiſtle in making Apologie for it: Yea, he more than inſinuateth the contrary, when he telleth what he uſed to do, and giveth a ſingular Reaſon for what he now did. I wonder that common Senſe doth not teach him that ſuch an Act doth not import a Cuſtom. 3. That *it was intirely of his own eaſineſs and condeſcendency that he conſulted them in the matter*: This I have above refuted; and it is inconſiſtent with what himſelf elſewhere ſaith, that the Biſhop *was the Monarch*, and *the Presbyters his Senate*: I hope he will not ſay that it is *ex beneplacito* that Kings conſult their Parliaments: Unleſs he be for the Turkiſh Government both in Church and State.

§. 43. Another Teſtimony (which he calleth *Remarkable* p. 40.) is *Cyprian Ep.* 41. *had given a Deputation to* Caldonius *and ſome others, to examine the Ages, Qualifications, and Merits of ſome in* Carthage, *that he, whoſe Province it was to promote Men to Eccleſiaſtical Offices, might be well informed about them, and promote none but ſuch as were meek, and humble, and worthy.* His Remark is, *he ſpeaks of himſelf in the ſingular Number, as having the power of promoting; and he founds that Power, and appropriats it to himſelf,*

ſelf, upon his having the care of the Church, and the Government of Her committed to him, For *A.* I obſerve a few things on this diſcourſe. 1. This Delegation of *Caldonius* and the reſt, was not to *Carthage*, as our Author dreameth; which appeareth by the end of the Epiſtle, in which he bids *Caldonius*, &c. *read this* Ep. *to the Brethren, and tranſmit it to* Carthage *to the Clergy*: which had been incongruous if their Errand and Work had been at *Carthage*. Next, this is in conſiſtent with what *Cyprian*, and our Author ſaith was his Practice; *viz. to conſult the presbyters about who were fit to be ordained*: It is ſtrange that he ſhould ſend Strangers to *Carthage* for ſuch Enquiry, and to inform him, with the neglect of the Presbytery. 2. It is alſo clear from the Epiſtle, §. 1. That this Negotiation was about ſome Sufferers who belonged to the Church of *Carthage* (may be, baniſhed, or impriſoned, or confined ſome where) where they were in neceſſity; for he ſaith he ſent them, *ut expungeretis neceſſitates fratrum noſtrorum ſumptibus, &c.* That *they might pay their Debts* (as *Pamelius* expoundeth it) and *that they might furniſh them for following their Trades, if they ſo inclined*: And the enquiry about their fitneſs for Church-Work ſeemeth to be intended on the by; for he bringeth it in with *ſimul etiam.* 3. That *he ſpeaketh of himſelf in the ſingular Number*, doth no way infer that he alone was to promote any who were qualified among theſe Sufferers: Neither his having the care of Church Government committed to him: For *ego cui cura incumbit promoverem*, ſaith nothing at all of ſole care, nor of ſole Power. Not only a Moderator, but any Member of a Presbytery, to whom the Ordination of Miniſters belongeth, might ſay as much; might deſire to know worthy perſons, and give the Reaſon, that *it is not Curioſity, but it belongeth to my Office to Ordain ſuch as are fit, and therefore I deſire to know their qualities.* His next Citation hath no more ſtrength: For it ſaith no more than that ſome in a State of Schiſme have been ordained by falſe Biſhops; whence he inferreth, that *all Ordinations in the true, and in the falſe Church were perform-*

ed by Biſhops. This is not the Queſtion; but whether they were ordained by Biſhops acting each of them alone.

§. 44. He next bringeth *Ep.* 39. where *Cyprian* writeth to his Clergy, that he had Ordained *Celerinus*; and *Ep.* 29. *Saturus*, and *Optatus*; and that *tho' ſome of them were but young, and he Ordained them to Inferior Offices; yet he deſigned they ſhould ſit with him in their Riper Years: that is,* (ſaith our Author) *he deſigned them for the Presbyterate.* And he very Learnedly obſerveth, that *Cyprian telleth his Presbyters this in a very Authoritative Stile, even in a Stile by which Superiors uſed to ſignifie their Will and Pleaſure to their Subjects*; with a *be it known unto you.* Here a little Reflection will ſerve. 1. Here is ſtill the old Fallacy; *Cyprian* Ordain'd theſe Perſons, *ergo*, he did it alone. 2. It is ſo far from that, that of *Celerinus* he ſaith expreſly, it was done *by him and his Collegues*, *Ep.* 34. §. 1. As in the former, *Ep.* 33. he had ſaid of *Aurelius*. 3. The preſent Diſſipation of the Church, made ſome things neceſſary, which were neither uſual, nor commendable out of that Caſe: as that *Cyprian*, with ſuch as he could then get to concur with him, Ordained ſome Perſons without the Concurrence of the Presbytery; who then, it ſeems, through the Perſecution that was at *Carthage*, could not get that Work managed. 4. For *Cyprian*'s Stile in his Epiſtle to the Presbytery, I think many moe will ſmile at his Fancy, than will be convinced by the ſtrength of his Reaſon drawn from it: *Cyprian*'s word is, *Sciutis*, which our Author putteth *in majuſculis*, to give his Argument ſome more pith: but who knoweth not that this Expreſſion ſignifieth barely a notifying of a thing to another; and is commonly uſed (eſpecially in the Latine Tongue) to Superiors, Inferiors, or Equals. It is a token of a mind deeply impreſſed with *the Majeſty of a Biſhop*, (as he elſewhere expreſſeth himſelf,) when this word doth ſo ſound in his ears. The Ordination of *Novatianus*, which he next bringeth as an Argument for him, rather is againſt him: it was an Act condemned by the Clergy and People, by *Cyprian*'s conſtant Practice; and that which he

he lookt on as Duty, (as hath been ſhewed before,) and was the Practice of an Aſpiring *Pope*: yea which himſelf promiſed ſhould not be made a Præcedent. Can any body think this is a good Argument to prove the Cuſtom of that Age? Neither can it be made appear, that this Ordination was performed by the Biſhop alone: eſpecially ſeing our Author ſaith, *the Biſhop prevailed and Ordained him*. It is like he prevailed with ſome, at leaſt, of the Clergy, tho' they did at firſt much reſiſt it. He ſaith, *p.* 42. that *any concurrence of Presbyters with the Biſhop in Ordination, is not to be found in* Cyprian's *Works, nor in his Age*. I hope the Reader is by this time convinced of the contrary. He next, *p.* 43. bringeth for Proof, the *ſecond Canon of the Apoſtles*, commonly ſo called, which is, *let a Presbyter be Ordained by one Biſhop, as likewiſe a Deacon, and the reſt of the Clergy*. But our Author might know, that the Authority of theſe *Canons*, is controverted even among Papiſts: as *Sixtus Senenſis, Lib.* 2. *ad vocem Clemens, p.* (*mihi*) 62, 63. And *Caranza. Summa. Concilior*: and others ſhew. The Contentions that are about the number of them, make them to be all ſuſpected. *Rivet. Critic. Sacr. Lib.* 1. *C.* 1. *p.* 93. and P. *Martyr. Loc. Com. Claſſ.* 4. *C.* 4. *p.* (*mihi*) 779. bring ſufficient Grounds for rejecting them, as neither done by the Apoſtles, nor collected by *Clement*, as is alledged. Again if this *Canon* were admitted, it proveth not the Concluſion: for one Biſhop Ordaineth, when the Moderator with the Presbytery doth it: and that *Canon* is obſerved, when no more are called together to the Ordination of a Presbyter. His Compariſon of the Biſhop's Power in this, with the *Rights of Majeſty in giving Commiſſions*, is vain Talk: unleſs he can prove a Monarchy, and that abſolute in the Church, which can never be done: for the *Canon* mentioned, being univerſally received in *Cyprian*'s time, it is not without Doubt, as he alledgeth, for all *Beveregius*'s Arguments which he boaſteth of; but produceth none of them. One thing I cannot paſs, *p.* 44. he telleth, that *after Cyprian*'s *time, it was appointed by the Canons, that Presbyters ſhould concur with the Biſhop*

ſhop in Ordinations: which overthroweth all his Diſcourſe of the Biſhop's *Majeſty, Soveraignty, Incontrollable and Unaccountable Power*, &c. And it is evident to any who is Converſant in the Hiſtory of the Church, that Epiſcopal Power did rather continually increaſe, than ſuffer Diminution, till it arrived at the height of the *Papacy*, (which in the beſt ſenſe, is his *Sublime Faſtigium Sacerdotii.*) And then indeed the *Pope* began to clip the Wings of other Biſhops, that he might crow over them.

§. 45. His third Prerogative of the Biſhop in *Cyprian's* time, *is his full Power, without asking the conſent or concurrence of either Clergy or People, to ſetle Presbyters within his Diſtrict.* And on this occaſion he ridiculeth our Principle of *the peoples Power of chooſing their own Miniſters.* All the Prooff of this confident Aſſertion, and inſolent Contempt of them who are otherwiſe minded, is, *Cyprian Ep.*40. wrote to *Carthage, that they ſhould receive* Numidicus *as a Presbyter among them*: and our Author addeth, *probably he was ordained before.* 1. If our Author had pleaſed to ſtate and argue the Queſtion about the *Power of Election*, I ſhould have been willing to joyn Iſſue with him. Or if he had thought fit to anſwer what I have elſewhere written on that Head, in a Book that he hath ſeen, and cited, when he thought he could ſay ſomething againſt it, I ſhould have conſidered the ſtrength of what he would ſay: but he doth wiſely ſhun that Controverſie: neither ſhall I dip in it, further than is neceſſary for anſwering his Book. 2. If *Numidicus was ordained before*, then was he alſo placed in *Carthage* before; and we have cauſe to think that he was ordained by the conſent and concurrence of the Presbyters of *Carthage*: at leaſt our Author cannot prove the contrary, which is neceſſary for eſtabliſhing his Concluſion. 3. He who animadverteth on *Pamelius's* Notes on *Cyprian*, hath theſe Words, on the beginning of the Epiſtle, *Etſi vocatio* Numidici *magis erat extraordinaria quam ordinaria, tamen non ſine plebe* Carthaginenſe *Presbyterio aſcribitur*: whence he inferreth, that Ordinations without their conſent, are *profana & irrita.* 4. His work is to prove that it was the Practice and Principle of the

the *Cyprianick-Age*, that a Bishop by himself placed Ministers: this cannot be inferred from one single instance; and that in a time of Persecution and Dissipation; and where there was so signal appearance of Divine determination, that *Cyprian*'s words are, *admonitos nos, & instructos dignatione divina, sciatis, ut Numidicus Presbyter adscribatur Presbyterorum Carthaginiensium numero.* Any who desireth to be fully satisfied in this Point of Election of Pastors, let him read *Blondel. Apolog. Pro sententia Hieron.* from *p.* 379. to the end, even to *p.* 548. where it is traced through all the Ages of the Church.

§. 46. The Bishop's fourth Priviledge is, *he had the Disposal of all the Revenues of the Church.* This our Author maintaineth *p.* 44, *&c. he had the full Power of this*, saith he, *ibid.* I here observe, that if we should yield all that he asserteth, it maketh nothing for the *sole Power* of the Bishop in *Jurisdiction*, or *Government of the Church*: for these distributions were always reckoned a Service, not any Act of Government in the Church: the Object of Church Power are not τὰ βίβλια. Further, I observe, that the Authoritative Direction in managing these Matters, did belong to all Church Rulers: The Apostles had the Power; but they were not at leisure to attend the managing of these things, as our Author's Bishop is; but committed it to Deacons, who were Officers appointed for that very end, *Act.* 6. I observe thirdly, that however to be thus imployed, might sute well with the way and temper of the the Bishops of our time; who generally are more imployed about Secular Affairs, than in Preaching: it was not consistent with the Labour of the Primitive Bishops about the Gaining of Souls. Fourthly, it is evident, that in the Ages after the Apostles, the Deacons had the Charge of the *bona Ecclesiastica*; *ergo*, not the Bishop only. *Origen in Matth.* 16. *Mensis Ecclesiasticarum pecuniarum Diaconi præsunt.* Item, *Diaconi qui non bene tractant pecuniarum Ecclesiasticarum mensas, & semper de eis fraudant, & ipsas quas dispensant non secundum justitiam dispensant & divites fiunt de rebus pauperum, ipsi sunt numularii pecuniarum,*

rum, menſas habentes quas evertet Dominus. It is fifthly to be obſerved, how abſurd it is, and what a ſnare, for any one man to have the ſole Diſpoſal of all the Goods of the Church, who may take what he will of them, for his *propria portio*, (to uſe our Author's words) and give what he will to the other Church-Officers, and to the Poor. This is a Truſt might make bad Biſhops (and ſuch there were even in *Cyprian*'s time) a Scandal, and might expoſe the beſt to Obloquie: and lay a Foundation for perpetual Grumblings and Diſcontents in the Church: to prevent which, the Lord by his Apoſtles, appointed Deacons to ſuperintend that Affair, *Act.* 6. Let us now hear what our Author pleadeth for his Opinion: he telleth us that *the Biſhop not only had his propria portio*, which he will have to be *the third of all*; and he obſerveth, that *this made Fortunatianus and Baſilides ſo earneſt for Reſtitution to their Sees, after Depoſition*, (and in our days maketh many Sell, or Ruine the Church for theſe Lucrative Promotions) but he affirmeth the Biſhop had alſo the Diſpoſal of the reſt. For which his Proof, firſt as to the Clergies part; *Felicisſimus is blamed for contending about his ſhare, contrary to his Duty to his Biſhop: and others are praiſed who took their ſhares as the Biſhop ſhould pleaſe to diſpenſe them.* *A.* 1. That the Biſhop here is meant in his ſole, or ſingle Capacity; and not rather in Conjunction with the Presbytery wherein he præſided, is denyed, and can never be proved. Yea, the contrary is evident, *Ep.* 41. (which he citeth) where ſpeaking of them who were ſo tractable, he uſeth theſe words, *& vobis acquieſcere maluiſſe*; that is, ſubmitted to their (the Presbyteries) Determination about their ſhares. 2. If a School Boy ſhould make ſuch a Verſion of Latine into Engliſh, as our Author here doth, he would be laſht for it. He turneth, *Epiſcopo Diſpenſante, as the Biſhop ſhould pleaſe to Diſpenſe them*: whereas the Biſhop's Diſpenſing, was nothing but his giving out Sentence as the Presbytery had Determined; not as he, by himſelf, pleaſed. Likewiſe, he taketh no notice of theſe words, *& vobis acquieſcere maluiſſe*: which is a great Error in Tranſlation. 3. It is evident from

from *Cyprian*'s own words, that he did not act ſolely in this Matter, but with the Authoritative Concurrence of the Presbytery; for a little before the words cited, he ſaith, *cumque poſt hæc omnia, nec loci mei honore motus, nec veſtra authoritate & præſentia fractus*, &c. where he blameth *Feliciſſimus* for deſpiſing the Biſhops honour, and the Presbyters Authority: clearly inſinuating the Difference of the Biſhop and Presbyters of his time, that he had more Honour than they; but not more Authority. The ſame way are we to underſtand *Cyprian*'s promoting *Aurelius* and *Celerinus* only to the Degree of Lectors; but entitleing them to the Maintenance of Presbyters: *viz.* that *Cyprian* might propoſe this to the Presbytery, tho' he could not effect it without them: his words are, *Presbyterii honorem deſignaſſe me illis, & ut ſportulis iiſdem* —— he deſigned it, becauſe they were choice Young-men, but it was the Presbytery concurring with him, that muſt make this effectual. He ſaith for the Poors part, *the Biſhop's Power in Diſtributing it, is ſo evident from Ep.* 5. *and* 41. *that I need not inſiſt on it. A.* In *Ep.* 41. (which is that we were juſt now Debating about) there is not one word to that purpoſe; but that he had ſent ſome to relieve the Neceſſities of ſome Sufferers: but out of what Fond, whether his *propria portio*, or any other, is not ſaid. And if it were out of the Churches Stock, it is not ſaid he did this without the Presbytery: he might very well ſay he did it, when the Presbytery appointed it, and he put it in Execution. What he ſaith in the 5. *Ep.* is as fully againſt our Author's Deſign, as any thing can be. He bids them, both in Diſcipline and Diligence, *act both their own parts and his.* And he hath theſe words *quantum autem ad ſumptus ſuggerendos, ſive illis qui glorioſa voce Deum confeſſi, in carcere ſunt conſtituti, ſive iis qui pauperes & indigentes laborant, & tamen in Domino perſeverant, peto ut nihil deſit: cum ſumma omnis quæ redacta eſt, illic ſit apud Clericos diſtributa propter ejuſmodi caſus, &c.* Is it not here evident, that the Clergy are intruſted with the Poors Money, and are to diſtribute it as need requireth: and that this Diſtribution in *Cyprian*'s Abſence,

was a doing of their own Work and his; so that they Acted not as his Delegats. Further, they *Acted their own part and his*, when one of them did præside in their Meetings in his Absence: which was, in these days, his peculiar Work; neither do we find that he Deputed one to præside; but left it to the Presbytery, to choose whom they thought fit. He next bringeth the 38. *and* 41. *Canons of the Apostles*, to prove what he designed. I have above shewed what Weight is to be laid on their Authority. Nor do they give this Power to the Bishop alone; but the Bishop is to be lookt on, with respect to what is there said, as præsiding in the Presbytery. What he citeth out of *Justine Martyr*, saith no more, but the Bishop hath τὴν φροντίδα, the Care of the Ecclesiastical Goods: which we willingly yield to him, and to every one of the Presbytery: but it is not said, he alone hath this Care. He would have us believe, that this sole Power of the Bishop, is fairly founded on Scripture: but citeth no place. I know no more where to find these places of Scripture, than I know where to find some places of *Cyprian* that he citeth. I am sure *Act.* 6. maketh nothing for him; but on the contrary. Neither 2 *Corinth* 8. *and* 9. *Chapters*. For *Paul* was a Delegate in carrying that Contribution to *Judea*: and if he had claimed more Power; it will be hard to prove the Bishop's Power to extend as far as that of an Apostle.

§. 47. The Bishop's fifth Power that he alone possessed is, *of imposing charitable Contributions on all the Christians within his District, for the Relief of Strangers, &c.* For which he refereth to *Ep.* 62. *and* 78. but citeth no words. I can find nothing to that purpose in either of them, as in my Book. For his alledging *Soter* Bishop of *Rome*, whom *Dionysius* of *Corinth* commendeth for this Practice, cited by *Eusebius*, *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 23. (*mihi* 22.) there is no more in it, but that *Dionysius* commendeth that Church for their wonted charitable Distributions to other Churches; and that *Soter* had observed, and improved this Custom: this may be fairly expounded of exhorting to Charity without Authoritative

Authoritative Impoſing of Contributions; which any Miniſter may do. And if he did impoſe, it is not ſaid he did it by himſelf, tho' he is only mentioned; as, perhaps, being ſingularly active in ſtirring up both the Presbytery and the People: and he was to publiſh in the Church, the Presbyteries Determination in this. What is there in all this for a *ſole Power* in this Matter? His next full Power is, *Indicting of Faſts*: for which he citeth *Tertullian de Jejun.* But it is obſervable that *Tertullian* ſpeaketh of Biſhops in the plural number; now it is not to be thought that no Faſts were Indicted but by a Meeting of Dioceſans: wherefore *Epiſcopi* muſt be the Presbytery. Or if he mean the ſeveral Biſhops in their ſeveral Churches: it may be rationally underſtood of the Biſhop's intimating to the People, what is by common Conſent Determined; not what he enjoyneth by his *ſole Authority.* The ſeventh Branch of the Biſhop's Prerogative is, *to Convocate the Presbytery and Deacons.* And let him enjoy it, for it is what we grant to our Moderator: and there is a natural neceſſity, that it be in the Power of ſome perſon to call them together, when any emergent doth require it. And ſeing in *Cyprian's* time, the Biſhop was the *conſtant Moderator*, it was conſequential that he ſhould be the *conſtant Conveener.* But what *Prerogative*, or *ſole Power* this doth infer, or what Eccleſiaſtick Authority above the Brethren it importeth, I cannot underſtand. Let any who hath clear uſe of reaſon judge, how this proveth the Biſhop's managing the Affairs of the Church *like a chief Governour*, as our Author dreameth, *p.* 48. Neither doth it appear, that the Biſhop might convocate the Presbyters at pleaſure, (as he fancieth) but when there was cauſe: as in the Inſtance he bringeth there was. He bringeth in, on this Occaſion, an Obſervation, that *Cornelius received theſe perſons about whom he called the Presbytery, without asking the Peoples conſent; but acquainted them after it was done.* But our Author hath forgot what he had a few Lines before ſaid, that *after they were received in the Presbytery, the People were made acquainted with it*; not one word of the Biſhop's receiving them

by himself. This is nothing contrary to Presbyterian Principles and Practices. Yea (as if he had design'd to refute himself) he citeth a Letter of these Persons, shewing that they were *reconciled to the Bishop, and to the whole Clergy*: where is then the Bishop's *sole Power* of receiving Penitents? He propoundeth to himself an Objection; that *the Presbyters at* Rome *met in a Vacancy, after the Bishop's Death: and at* Carthage, *in the time of* Cyprian's *Retirement.* To the second Instance he Answereth, that *Cyprian left a Delegation for their Meeting*: which he proveth strangely: *he wrote,* (Ep. 5.) *that they should faithfully perform his Office and their own: where,* saith he, *we have distinct Offices, and an express setling of a Delegation. A.* For distinct Offices, his Mistake of the Latine Word hath misled him; it is *fungamini illic & vestris partibus & meis*: I see not but one Presbyter may say this to another. For his Delegation, I think few others can perceive it in these words; may not any Member of a Presbytery, but especially the Moderator, say the same, by a Letter to the Presbytery? It importeth no more but a Warning to be vigilant in their Work. See §. 46. His next Citations is out of *Ep.* 14. (It is *Ep.* 6.) Where *Cyprian commands them to perform the Office of Vicars to him. Cyprian*'s words are, *hortor & mando ut vice mea fungamini circa gerenda ea quæ administratio religiosa deposcit.* Here is no more but what any of Christ's Ambassadours may say; he chargeth them to do their Duty; and he had Authority from Christ, not as Bishop, but as a Pastor of the Chnrch, and Christ's Ambassadour, to enjoyn this. If *Cyprian* had our Author's meaning, then all Religious Administration must cease, without the Bishop's presence, or Delegation: which is absurd. For his *mea vice*, it signifieth no more, but that his Absence might be supplied by their Diligence. *Cyprian*'s *warm recenting what some of them did without his allowance*; shall be elsewhere considered: it was, that some Presbyters without both their Moderator, and the Presbytery, received some of the Lapsed: which was wholly irregular, and blame worthy. He next, to the Presbyters Meeting, *sede vacante*,

vacante, Anſwereth; that *they might meet*; *but they might only determine in ruled caſes*. That is *gratis dictum*: but if they might act in any caſe, it is an Argument that they had Church Power in their Perſons; and that it was not *ſolely* in the Biſhop. The laſt of the Biſhop's Prerogatives that he pleadeth for, (tho' he telleth us, *p.* 50. *that he could collect more*,) is, *his Delegating, not his Presbyters in common, but two of them*, Rogatianus *and* Numidicus, *with two Biſhops*, Caldonius *and* Herculanus, *to conſider the ſtate of the Poor at* Carthage, *and to pronounce the Sentence of Excommunication againſt* Feliciſſimus *and* Augendus: *which they executed againſt them, and ſome others*. If this Diſcourſe prove ſuch a Power of Delegation, it will alſo prove ſuch a Power in one Biſhop over another; which our Author will not allow; ſeing he aſſerteth, *p.* 27, 28, 35. *that every Biſhop is ſupreme, and hath no Eccleſiaſtical Superior on Earth*. 2. Sending a Meſſenger to do for us, what we are reſtrained from doing, is not always an Act of Authority: one Friend may ſend another, if he yield to it, as well as a Maſter may ſend his Servant. 3. That which hath moſt Weight in our main Cauſe, (tho' it be impertinent to the preſent purpoſe,) is, that theſe Perſons were to Excommunicat *Feliciſſimus*, *&c.* To which I Anſwer, that this Excommunication might be Determined by the Presbytery, and it was *Cyprian*'s part, as Moderator, to intimate it; for which he ſubſtituteth the Perſons named. Here is no *ſole Power* of Excommunication. This is Countenanced by *Cyprian*'s own words, in that *Ep.* §. 2. that *Feliciſſimus had deſpiſed both him and the Presbytery. Nec meo honore motus, nec veſtra authoritate fractus*: It ſeems he had been tried before them, and Sentenced for Contumacy. Further, he was alſo ſuſpected of Adultery; which *Cyprian* would not judge by himſelf; but referred it to their Meeting, *ibid.*

§. 48. Having now examined our Author's firſt Principle, I proceed to the ſecond, which he advanceth, *p.* 50, *&c.* It is, that *in every thing relating to the Government of the Church, and her Diſcipline, the Biſhop had a Negative over all the other Church-Governours*,

Governours, within his Diſtrict: he had the ſupreme Power of the Keyes. He ſetteth about the proving of this Point with a high Degree of Confidence: but *let not him that putteth on his Armour boaſt as he that putteth it off.* He pretendeth to ſhew, that *Presbyters could not Baptize, nor Adminiſter the Lord's Supper, nor Excommunicate, nor Abſolve, nor Make, nor Reſcind Eccleſiaſtical Laws, without the Biſhop's Allowance.* For a foundation to our Anſwer to all his Diſcourſe on this Head, I ſhall re-mind the Reader of a Diſtinction of Presbyters above-mentioned. They were in *Cyprian*'s time, of three ſorts. 1. The Ruling Elders, who were no Preachers, and who with the Biſhop, (or Pariſh Miniſter,) and other Preaching Presbyters, (if there were any,) made up the Conſiſtory, by which the Affairs of the Congregation were managed. Theſe, I confeſs could Adminiſter no Sacrament, neither without, nor with the Biſhop's Licence. And for Acts of Ruling in the Church, it is probable enough, that they could do nothing without him who was *Præſes* in their Meetings, except, may be, in ſome extraordinary Caſes. 2. There were in ſome Churches, (eſpecially in great Cities) ſome Presbyters who were Ordained to the Work of the Miniſtry, but had no particular Charge, and were as our Probationers, or Students in Divinity Schools, (only with this Difference, that ours are not Ordained,) theſe might not Baptize, nor Adminiſter the Euchariſt, yea, nor Preach without the Allowance of the Biſhop, or Pariſh Miniſter. And it is ſo alſo among us: if ſome Ordained Miniſters happen to live in a Pariſh, whereof they are not Paſtors, (as ſometimes falleth out in great Cities,) it is diſorderly for them to exerciſe their Miniſtery within another man's Charge, without his Call or Allowance. Theſe Presbyters, in *Cyprian*'s time, were in ſomethings, like Evangeliſts, whom the Biſhops imployed, when themſelves could not overtake all their Work: and if theſe be called the Biſhop's Curats, (as our Author doth all Presbyters,) I ſhall not much reclaim. Theſe were, as *the Sons of the Prophets*, bred by the Biſhop for the Miniſtery: of this ſort of Presbyters, ſee *P. Baynes Dioceſan's*

Dioceſan's Tryal, p. 63. A third ſort of Presbyters, were the Miniſters of the ſeveral Pariſhes, among whom the Moderator of the Presbytery, or other Church Judicatory, was in a peculiar manner, called the Biſhop: and they alſo often were called Biſhops, with reſpect to their own Parochial Charge. Now, if our Author mean, that a Biſhop in a City had ſuch Power over the Presbyters, or Miniſters in the Villages, or Places about, that they might not Baptize, *&c.* without his Allowance, I utterly deny it; and maintain that every ſuch Presbyter, Miniſter, or Parochial Biſhop, (by what ever name ye deſign him,) had in *Cyprian*'s time, as full Power in his Pariſh, as the great Biſhop had in his, tho' the one was more in eſteem than the other.

§. 49. I ſhall now conſider his Proofs for what he affirmeth. He beginneth with *Baptiſm*, and pretendeth to prove, that *Presbyters could not Baptize without the Biſhop's Leave.* His firſt Citation is, *Cyprian* ſaith, *Biſhops give the firſt Baptiſm to Believers.* Which we deny not, if ye underſtand it of Pariſh Miniſters. But if he mean Biſhops in Cities, who were the Præſidents in Presbyteries, we deny that *Cyprian* aſſerteth that. His next Teſtimony is out of *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 73. and *Firmil.* and *Fortunatus* Biſhop of *Thurobaris*: But it is evident, and he confeſſeth it, that the Queſtion by them treated, is, whether Presbyters, who by Hereſie, or Schiſm, had departed from the Communion of the Church, might Baptize, and if they they did, whether that Baptiſm was valid, or the Perſon was to be again Baptized, and that Baptiſm eſteemed null: And in this we do ſo far agree with theſe Fathers, as to think that all the Adminiſtrations of ſuch Hereticks, or Schiſmaticks are irregular, and to be condemned: and that none ought ſo to ſeparate from the Church, while ſhe keepeth the Way of Truth, and requireth no unlawful Terms of Communion of her Miniſters, or other Members. But none of theſe Fathers, did ever Aſſert, that in the Church, a ſound Presbyter could not Baptize without the Biſhop's Leave, within the Limits of his own Charge. That they mean no more than I ſay, is evident, for they plead,

that

that *none can Baptize out of the Church, nor Bind or Looſe out of the Church*, and they ſay expreſly, that *none can Baptize, but they who are Founded in the Evangelical Law*; and I hope it will not be denyed, that Miniſters of Congregations are Founded on that Law, as well as theſe of great Cities, who were then called Biſhops, becauſe of their Præcedency in Church Meetings. That Biſhops *are named in theſe Reaſonings, as having the Power of Baptizing*, maketh nothing againſt us, becauſe all Pariſh Miniſters were ſo called; and none without their Allowance ought to intrude on their Charge, in this, or any other Adminiſtration: and becauſe the Authority for Baptizing, and other Church Work was Communicated from the Presbytery, by their Præſident, the Biſhop: he indeed gave the Power; but not by his own ſole Authority, but by that of the Presbytery. The teſtimony of *Tertullian* cometh next: who ſaith, *de Baptiſmo*, cap. 17. *the High Prieſt, who is the Biſhop, hath the Power of Baptizing, and after him, (or in Subordination to him,* ſaith our Author,) *Presbyters and Deacons.* A. 1. *Tertullian* doth not ſpeak of Biſhops, as diſtinct from the Paſtors of particular Flocks; but from Presbyters who had no Charge: if this Author put another meaning on his words, let him prove it. 2. *Tertullian* a little above, *puto autem licuit & tingere, cui licuit prædicare*: I hope he will not ſay, that *Tertullian* thought, that no Miniſter might Preach without the Biſhop's Leave; tho' he might think that the unſetled Presbyters, ought to Preach in no man's Charge without his Leave. 3. *Tertullian* a little below, alloweth *Laicks*, yea, *Women*, to Baptize, in caſe of neceſſity, without the Biſhop's Leave: as he doth in the place cited, the Deacons to do it with the Biſhop's Leave, all which I look on as ſpoken without Warrant. 4. *Tertullian* groundeth his Diſcourſe on this; that *the honour of the Church requireth, that the Biſhop's Allowance ſhould be had*; and on this occaſion, condemneth *Emulation, as the Mother of Schiſm*: and citeth that place, *all things are lawful, but all things are not expedient.* From all which it is eaſie to gather, that he only condemned them who Baptized without Church Authority, which

which the Biſhop, as Mouth of the Presbytery, did Communicat. 5. It is wholly without Warrant that this Learned Author addeth to *Tertullian*'s Words, *and in Subordination to him*: *dehinc* (which is that Father's Word) doth neither ſignifie, nor can import ſo much: all that can be built on it, is a prior Dignity to the Biſhop; in this, and other parts of the Miniſterial Work. His laſt Citation is *Ignatius*, *it is not lawful to Baptize without the Biſhop*. *A.* That is, without the Authority of the Presbytery, which the Biſhop as their *Præſes*, conveyeth.

§. 50. He Aſſerteth next, (*p.* 52.) that *no Presbyter could Adminiſter the Euchariſt within the the Biſhop's Diſtrict, without his Leave, or againſt his Interdict.* To this, what hath already been ſaid, is a full Anſwer. No Presbyter might do this within the Charge of a Pariſh Biſhop, without his Leave: nor yet in a Presbyterial Diſtrict, without the Allowance of the Presbytery, given out by their *Epiſcopus Præſes*. His Proofs are exactly like the former; *Cyprian* (ſeverely and juſtly) *laſheth ſome Schiſmatical Presbyters, who by themſelves, without* Cyprian, *and without the Presbytery, did Adminiſter the Lord's Supper to ſome of the Lapſed, who were not duely Reconciled to the Church*: I know no Presbytery that would not condemn this, if it were done within their Bounds; yea, they would think their Authority contemned; and their Moderator ſlighted, who ſhould have been Applyed to, to call the Presbytery for Conſulting about this: who, with them, ſhould have Authoritatively Determined in this Matter: and this Neglect of the Biſhop was in that time, the more conſpicuous, that his Præcedency was conſtant, and known to all; which was the cauſe the Biſhop is ſo often named, in theſe things that concerned not him alone, but the whole Community. It is to the ſame purpoſe, which he next alledgeth of *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *giving a Command that any Lapſed, in danger of Death, if Supplicating for it, ſhould have the Euchariſt.* For that may be underſtood of *Dionyſius* enjoyning this to the unfixed Presbyters of *Alexandria*, that it ſhould be done within that Pariſh, where-

of *Dionyſius* was Paſtor: or of the Presbytery, by *Dionyſius* their *Præſes*, to be obſerved within their District. What *Ignatius* ſaith, that *that is only to be eſteemed a firm, and valid Euchariſt, which is Celebrated by the Biſhop, or by his Authority*: this, I ſay, admitteth of the ſame Anſwer; that none ought to Celebrate that Holy Ordinance in any Congregation, but the Paſtor of it, or whom he doth call to do it for him: I might call in Queſtion the Authority of theſe Epiſtles of *Ignatius* which he citeth; but I will not digreſs into that Controverſie; *ſub judice lis eſt, Theologi certant.* There is nothing of any more Weight in his next Citation; where *Cyprian*, againſt the *Novatians*, declareth that *there could be no true Sacrament among them, becauſe they are out of the Church; and had aſſumed to themſelves an Epiſcopal Chair, and a Power of Baptizing, and Offering.* It is plain that this is meant of them, who had caſt off the Churches Authority, that was exerciſed by her Paſtors, (who are here called Biſhops,) but it no way proveth, that ſome Paſtors of the Church, muſt depend on one of them, for this Authority. It is tedious to repeat the ſame thing ſo often; in Anſwer to ſo many Arguments, which are materially the ſame. After all theſe numerous Teſtimonies, he cometh *p.* 55. to an Artificial Argument, in which kind of Arguings, he ſeemeth not to be very formidable; he ſuppoſeth *he hath fully proved the Biſhop to be the Principle of Unity; the Chief Governour, that by Conſequence the ſupreme Power of the Keyes belongeth to him: that he was the viſible Head of the Church; it is highly reaſonable on that account, that he ſhould have the chief Power of Diſpenſing the Sacraments: and that they might not be Diſpenſed without him.* I have already ſhewed the Weakneſs of all theſe Grounds he buildeth upon: and therefore the Conſequence built on them, muſt fall to the ground: we are no leſs ſenſible than he is, of *the evil of Receiving, and continuing unworthy Perſons in the Church; and that the Governours of the Church muſt be Judges in this matter*; but we are not yet convinced, that the Biſhop by himſelf, rather than the Community of Church Rulers, are that Judge: and I muſt take leave

leave to tell him, that (however it was in the Primitive Times,) in our Days, the excluding of unworthy Persons, Ministers and others, hath been much more to be observed, where the Church is ruled by a Parity of Presbyters; than where it is governed by one Prelate.

§. 51. This Learned Author, supposing that he had proved the Bishop's *Negative* in Administration of the Sacraments, hence inferreth *his Soveraign Interest in Excommunication, Absolution, Enjoyning Pennance, &c.* Which Consequence I shall not contest with him: but I hope the Reader is now satisfied, that he hath not sufficiently established the Antecedent: nor will we yield that *Cyprian, or his Contemporaries had, or laid Claim to such a Prerogative.* But our Author, tho' he thinketh he might supersede the Proof of his *Negative* in these other things, yet, because *he will give all possible Satisfaction*, he undertaketh a *Deduction of further Powers in the Person of* Cyprian: of which we have a long History, beginning at *p.*56. I have nothing to observe on the account he giveth of *Cyprian's Conversion, Promotion,* (save what I have observed out of *Pontius*, of his Promotion to be Presbyter and Bishop *simul & semel*: but what ever be in that, it hath no great Influence on our Cause,) *the Opposition he met with, his Eminency for Grace and Gifts, the wicked Courses his Enemies took, while, under the Persecution by* Decius, *he retired from* Carthage; *how they got some of the Confessors and Martyrs to Countenance them; and they upon this, were emboldened by themselves, to Absolve some of the Lapsed.* Nothing of this I contradict, except what I now said. He hath run thus far without a Check; and therefore ariveth at the Confidence to say, *p.* 58. *now consider what followeth, and speak your Conscience, and tell me, if St.* Cyprian *was not more than either single Presbyter, or Presbyterian Moderator,* I shall yield him yet a little more, in what he saith of *Cyprian's Meekness and Humility; of his being alarmed with this Practice, that this was an unparalelled Practice, and that* Cyprian *did zealously and vigorously oppose it.* And for all this I shall speak my Conscience, and shall

give Reaſon for my Light, that *Cyprian* was no Dioceſan Biſhop, in our modern ſenſe; and that he neither had, nor claimed *ſole Power*, nor a *Negative*, in the Government of the Church; and that, bating what I yielded in ſtating the Queſtion, §. 9, 10. He was no more but a ſingle Presbyter, that is a Pariſh Miniſter, or Presbyterian Moderator. And indeed all that he here bringeth, and looketh on as ſo ſtrongly Argumentative, is already Anſwered, he having cited all, or moſt of the places before, which he here quoteth. He bringeth three Epiſtles of *Cyprian* to prove his Aſſertion.

§. 52. The firſt is that *to the Confeſſors and Martyrs*: where I find nothing but a ſharp Reproof of them for going without their Line: and he blameth thoſe Presbyters who had abſolved the Lapſed ſo diſorderly: only what ſeemeth here to contain an Argument is, that they ſhould have *Petitioned the Biſhop for reſtoring of theſe Lapſed, and not done it without him.* The Anſwer here is eaſie; and often before given, that the fault of theſe turbulent Presbyters was, that they took this Act of Church Power on themſelves, without the Presbytery; whereas the regular way had been to Petition the Biſhop, that he might call the Presbytery, and that he with them might cognoſce of that Affair. I have laid down ſufficient warrant for thus underſtanding his words, from his declared purpoſe, founded on *Conſcience of Duty, to do nothing without the Concurrence of the Presbytery*, ſee §. 12. And it is like, I may after bring yet further Evidence, that his Principles led him to this Conduct: At preſent, I take notice of that plain Paſſage, *Ep.* 15. *ad Clerum*, ſpeaking of receiving the Lapſed, *quæres* (ſaith he) *cum omnium noſtrum Concilium, & Sententiam ſpectet, præjudicare ego, & ſoli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo.* And he deſireth that that Affair might be put off; *donec pace nobis à Domino redditâ, in unum convenire, & ſingulorum cauſas examinare poſſumus*: if *Cyprian* ſeem to my Adverſary to ſpeak *in pure Prelatical Stile*, as he ſaith, *p.* 6. He ſeemeth to me here, to ſpeak in the Stile of a Presbyterian Moderator. Of the ſame Importance is the

next

next Epiſtle cited, which was to the *Clergy of* Carthage, (he doth not call them his Clergy, as our Author wordeth it; and if he had, there had been no Argument in it,) he ſharply reproveth (not the Presbyters in common, as our Author fouly repreſenteth the matter; for he writeth in a loving Stile to them: but) ſome of the Presbyters who had received ſome of the Lapſed moſt irregularly; and that becauſe they had not taken the due courſe for receiving theſe Lapſed, which ſhould have been done *per impoſitionem manuum Epiſcopi & Cleri*, not by the Biſhops ſole Authority. He doth indeed here *ſpeak like a Biſhop*; that is a faithful Paſtor; but not as a Biſhop pretending to *ſole Juriſdiction*; or a *Negative* in the Government of the Church. His third Epiſtle is *to the People*; where we have the ſame Complaint of the Irregularity of the Schiſmatical Presbyters; and complaineth that *the honour of his Prieſthood, and of his Chair, was not reſerved to him.* This can never evince that *Cyprian* pretended to a Power to manage that Affair by himſelf: I ſee nothing here inconſiſtent with the Power, or the Stile of the Moderator of a Presbytery, or Paſtor of a Congregation: ſave that the Moderator then, being conſtant, his part in the management of publick Affairs was more obvious, and therefore more taken notice of. He hath yet a further Citation, wherein *Cyprian* telleth the Clergy, that *they ought to inform him of every thing that happens*; *that ſo I may* (ſaith he) *Adviſedly and Deliberatly, give Orders concerning the Affairs of the Church*; let any one compare this Tranſlation with *Cyprian*'s own words, which are faithfully enough ſet down by our Author in the Margin: Is *limare Conſilium* to *give Order*? It is to poliſh, and amend his Advice, and make it more exact: he then, in his Retirement, wills them to write often and diſtinctly to him of all Occurrences, that he, as making ſuch a figure in their Society, might give the more accurate Advice about what was to be done: this is no *Prelatical*, but a *plain Presbyterian Stile.*

§. 53. On this occaſion he is pleaſed p. 61, 62.) to take notice of, and tragically aggravate a Paſſage in *rational Defence of Non-*

Non-conformity, p. 179. where he thinketh *Cyprian* is reflected on *as shewing too much Zeal in that Cause* (*viz.* of his Episcopal Authority being neglected) *and that possibly he stretched his Power a little too far, as afterward many did: he was a holy, and meek man; but such may be a little too high*: This he stretcheth his Invention to expose, as *contradictory to it self*; *injurious to* Cyprian, *and an uncharitable, or ignorant Sugestion*: his more sedate Thoughts after all this Huffiness, may inform him better: That Author as he was not so straitned with his learned Adversaries Arguments, as he imagineth (they being the very same which now I have examined) so he was far from speaking Contradictions, nor did he seek to reconcile *Pride and Patience*, *Supercilionsness and Self-denyal*, *Huffiness and Humility*, *carnal hight and Christian Holiness*: He was far from thinking on such ill Qualities with respect to that excellent person: Further than that the best of men have sinful Infirmity mixed with their Graces, and best Gifts. He might know and I shall not charge him with Ignorance in this) that Sin and Grace are consistent *in gradu saltem remissiore*: And that tho' it were ridiculous to say, that *Moses* was the meekest Man on Earth, and yet he was *Huffie*, and *Proud*, and *Passionate*: or that *Job* was *most patient*, and yet *he was impatient*- Notwithstanding it may be said, with our Author's leave; that neither of these holy Men was so perfect in the grace for which he is commended, as to have nothing of the contrary evil: Further I am of Opinion, that what might be imputed to the excellent *Cyprian*, was rather the Fault of the Age he lived in, than his personal Fault, there was then a Tendency toward *Church-Domination*, which did shew it self much more afterward: Tho' I still maintain it was not arrived at that Pitch that this Author imputeth to that time. He spendeth a great many words to prove that *Cyprian* did not stretch his Power too far in this matter: all which is lost labour; for that was no otherways imputed to him, than with a possibility; and on Account of his mentioning his own Episcopal Power more than he did the power of the Presbytery (which power of the Presbytery

he

he doth yet clearly owne, as I have proved) This had a shew of Usurpation; and did in time introduce it: It was the *Genius* of that age, to have too big thoughts of that *Prælation* of being *primus Presbyter*: And the best of men in that time were tinctured with this mistake. Wherefore he might have superceded his proving what *Figure the Martyrs then made*, I know their Interest went far, as to receiving the lapsed; yet I still think that they neither pretended to, nor was then ascribed to them, formal Church-Authority. What he largely discourseth, p. 64. of *Cyprian*'s dealing with the disorderly Presbyters, *not by Huffing, but by reason and Argument*, is as little to our purpose; in that, he did rationally, and Christianly: Yet in these Reasonings, as he in words, taketh more notice of his Episcopal Authority, than of the Presbytries Power, so upon the matter doth not derogate from the one, nor unduely highten the other: as hath been already shewed. I wonder at the Insinuation that my learned Antagonist maketh, p. 65. as if any had imagined it questionable, *whether* Cyprian, *or the Presbyters that he blameth, were guilty of Usurpation*: They did usurp most intollerably in doing that by themselves, which should have been done by *Cyprian* and the Presbytery: And it was no Usurpation to reprove, and threaten them with Censure for so doing. The power of the Presbytery was not here questioned; but the power of particular Presbyters who took the Power of the Presbytry upon them: And therefore the Presbytery who were not guilty, had no *Right of their own* to defend against *Cyprian*; but had just cause to joyn with him against these Usurpers. It is as insignificant, that *the seditious Presbyters repented, excused themselves, and desired a Form from* Cyprian: For it is ordinary for some to go from one Extreme to another. Besides that *seeking a Form* from him was to ask it from him, and the Presbytery, not from him alone. That *these Presbyters were generally condemned for their factious Practices*, I think none doubteth, and it is to little purpose to prove it so laboriously as our Author doth.

§. 54.

§. 54. Yet becauſe in his Proofs of it ſome things are interſperſed which may look like Arguments againſt what I plead for, I ſhall make ſome Obſerves on this Diſcourſe. He giveth us account of *Cyprian's writing to the Presbytery at* Rome, *they having then no Biſhop.* This I hope is a Token that *Cyprian* thought not that all Church Power at *Rome* dyed with the Biſhop; but that Presbyters are Church Rulers, and not the Biſhop only: In the return that the Presbytery at *Rome*, made to *Cyprian*, he fancieth that he findeth ſome Arguments for Epiſcopal *ſole Power*: which I ſhall a little conſider: He ſaith *they aſcribe to him a ſupreme and unaccountable Power*: I find no words that can be ſo conſtructed in either of the two Epiſtles that they write to him on that Subject; but on the contrary, they ſeem to inſinuate a Parity with him, while they frequently call him *Frater*. It would be thought great ſaucineſs, in our days, for Presbyters to write in that Stile to ſo great a Biſhop as *Cyprian* was eſteemed to have been, by our Prelats. Next, *they compare him to the Maſter of a Ship; who doeth not act in parity with the other Sea-men*; A. *omne ſimile claudicat.* a Moderator of a Presbytery may be ſo compared, as having a main hand in the Conduct of Affairs. Again the words of that Epiſtle import no more than making *Cyprian* the *Steerſman*: who tho' he be at the Helm, and the Safety of the Ship dependeth much on his Skill and Management, yet he is not always the Commander of the Ship; and the Safety of the Ship ſhould yet more depend on the *Steerſman*, if he were fixed, and always ſo imployed; as *Cyprian* was in the *Eccleſiaſtical Ship* at *Carthage*. He ſaith, that *the Roman Clergy tell* Cyprian *(and pray take notice of it*, ſaith he*) that they could determine nothing in that matter, wanting a Biſhop.* This is a Miſrepreſentation: for they tell their Mind plainly in the firſt of their two Epiſtles to *Cyprian*; that *he did well in repreſſing that Inſolency of ſome Presbyters; that the lapſed ſhould not be ſuddenly received*, and give the Reaſon, *recens eſt hoc lapſorum vulnus, & adhuc in tumorem plaga conſurgens; & idcirco certi ſumus, quod ſpatio productioris temporis, impetu iſto conſeneſcente, amabunt*

hoc

hoc ipſum ad fidelem ſe delatos medicinam. And in the ſecond Epiſtle they add another Reaſon why it was fit to delay that Affair of of cenſuring the lapſed, becauſe they wanted a Biſhop, not becauſe the Biſhop was to be the ſole Judge in that matter; but becauſe the Biſhop was he, *qui omnia iſta moderetur* (theſe are their own words) he was to preſide in that Affair. Seing then there was another reaſon for delaying, even where there was a Biſhop, as in *Carthage*, it was a ſuperadded reaſon why at *Rome* it ſhould be delayed, the Presbyterie being incomplete, by the want of a ſignificant Member. If it be ſaid, could they not chooſe a Moderator? *Anſw.* That Office through cuſtom being then fixed, and the Honour and Revenue that belonged to it being ſo conſiderable, it was not eaſie to get it done of a ſudden; and the iniquity of that time of Perſecution did add to the difficulty, as themſelves expreſs it; *Nondum enim Epiſcopus, propter rerum & temporum difficultates conſtitutus.* Our Author vitiateth their words, when he maketh them ſay, *who onely could define*, &c. There is no ſuch words in this Epiſtle: it is ſaid indeed of the Biſhop, *eorum qui lapſi ſunt poſſit cum authoritate & conſilio habere rationem.* But that ſaith nothing of *ſole Authority*, but ſuch as was to be acted in the Presbytery, and with their concurrence.

§. 55. He obſerveth likewiſe, that *they commend* Cyprian, *that he did not determine in that matter by himſelf alone; but took the advice of many: and this they impute not to the incompetency of his Authority for it; but to his condeſcendence.* *Anſ.* He doth wholly miſtake this Matter, for the *Roman Clergy*, in their Letter to *Cyprian*, do not at all take notice of what he did, or might do, with reſpect to his own Diſtrict, nor his adviſing with his own Presbytery; but that he had taken the advice, in ſuch a weighty caſe, of general concernment, of other Biſhops, and of the *Clergy at Rome*, And it is certain, that he, with the Presbytery at *Carthage*, might have determined in this Matter with reſpect to themſelves; and it was Prudence, and not want of Power, that made him adviſe with others. He bringeth another Teſtimony to the plenitude of Epiſ-

copal Power, from an Epistle from the *Clergy of Rome*, while they wanted a Bishop, to the *Clergy of Carthage*, when their Bishop was in his retirement: *in which case*, saith he, *they had the best occasion of speaking their mind freely, of the power of Presbyters, and the usurpation of Bishops*: in this Epistle he fancieth that he findeth Arguments for Episcopal *sole Power*: as first, they say, of themselves, and these at *Carthage*, that *they were only seemingly the Governours of these respective Churches; and only keep the Flock instead of the respective Pastors, the Bishops.* I had occasion to consider this Passage before, I blame his want of Wisdom, that seing he is pleased to give us this Translation of this Passage, he hath yet set down the Latine in the Margine: out of which one may easily discover his Error, without turning to the Epistle it self: It is a strange Translation, *Videmur Præpositi*, that is, *we only seem to be Governours.* I am sure, the Marginal Notes on this Epistle saith, they were *Pastores constituti.* And *Pamelius* from this Passage argueth for the Authority of the Church of *Rome* over other Churches; and he that animadverteth on *Pamelius* saith, *Clerus Romanus Carthaginensem agnoscit, quemadmodum & alios aliarum Ecclesiarum pastores, esse Christiani gregi præpositos*: wherefore *videmur* must rather signifie certainty than doubting, in this place; it appeareth not only to our selves, but to all, we are acknowledged for such. And that they did not mean by *vice Pastoris*, a vicarious Power delegated from the Bishop, is manifest, for the Bishop was dead, and we find no Power he left them, neither could he do it. Yea it is evident that they lookt on a Power residing in themselves, of which they were to give an account: *si negligentes inveniamur —— quoniam perditum non requisivimus*, &c. What is said of the lapsed continuing in their Penitency, that they might obtain Indulgence from them who can give it: the Word being *ab eo qui potest præstare.* It might be understood of Pardon from Christ, on their sincere Repentance, seing he alone can make Indulgence effectual: but if that seem strained, the Bishop with the Presbytery, not by himself, may fitly here be understood. He doth again, *pag.* 69. misrepresent

represent the Question, in these Words, *Let any man judge whether St.* Cyprian *or his presuming Presbyters had taken too much on them at* Carthage: But this mistake I noted before. Another Argument he bringeth, is from some *Martyrs and Confessors*, in an Epistle to *Cyprian, commending him for his conduct in opposing and censuring these Presbyters.* I also commend him for it: *Ergo* I think he had *sole Power* to manage that Affair: the consequence is naught. He haleth in another Argument into this Discourse: *these Martyrs and Confessors desire, that* Cyprian *being so glorious a Bishop, would pray for them: which they would not have done had they thought him a proud aspiring* Prelat, *that is a Limb of Antichrist, as this Author would fain give him out to have been*: It is an injurious Calumny: I never said, nor thought so: and no man can Wire-draw my words (with any sense or reason) to that meaning. I esteem *Cyprian's* Grace, Virtues, and Learning as much as he doth: and do judge that his Prayers, while he was on Earth, were worth asking: and that he was a glorious Bishop; but all this will not infer his *sole Power*, nor his *negative*. ——Cyprian's *excommunicating these Presbyters, and that fact being approven by others*, is not argumentative, unless he can prove that this *Cyprian* did by himself, without the Presbytery. He next bringeth the *Canons of the Apostles* (the insufficiency of which Authority I have above-shewed.) And *Ignatius*, that *nothing should be done without the Bishop, nor in opposition to him*: And *that the Bishop should be honoured.* All this is sufficiently Answered above. When a Bishop that is any Minister of the Gospel, acteth in his Sphere, and keepeth to the Rule the Word of God, to oppose him, to depart from him, not to honour him, is highly sinful. But I am sure *Cyprian* nor *Ignatius* never meant to enjoin absolute & illimited obedience to a Bishop, nor any man else. As for *doing nothing without the Bishop*, we grant that they who are under a Ministers charge, Prebyters or others, should act nothing in the Consistory without him; but this also must suffer a limitation; if he should prove so perverse as to oppose, and hinder every thing that is good, or what is necessary to be done; I de-

not think that *Ignatius* would blame the Presbyters for acting without him: otherwise there were no remedy but the Church must be ruined. If it be said, in that case they should complain. To whom must this Complaint be made: for *a Bishop hath no Superior on Earth*; if we believe this Author.

§. 56. The last of his three Principles, which he advanceth *p.*72. is, that, *all the Church-Governours within his District, Presbyters as well as others, were in St.* Cyprian's *time, subject to the Bishops Authority, and obnoxious to his Discipline.* This Principle and all that he saith for establishing of it, we might safely yield, without any hazard to our Cause: for we always maintained, that a Bishop, considered as a Paroch Minister, hath Authority over the Ruling-Elders, and the unfixed Preaching-Presbyters, if any be within his Parish; also considered as Moderator of the Presbytry, he is still a Minister, and hath Rule over all the Ministers, and People and Elders within the District, over which that Presbytery hath the oversight: but our Question is, whether he, by himself, hath the *sole Authority*; or he, as a Member of the Consistory, or Presbytery, hath a share in that Authority which resideth in that Body, or Community. This last we grant: the former we deny. His Proofs can never reach the conclusion that we deny: the first of which is, that *Cyprian saith, that our Lord chose Apostles, that is Bishops and Governours* (where by the way Note, that *Cyprian* owneth other Church-Governours, beside Bishops, and therefore they have not the *sole Authority*) *and the Apostles chose Deacons to be the Bishops and Churches Ministers.* Any body may see that this doth concern all Church-Rulers, not *sole Power* in the Bishop. Next he telleth us that *Cyprian called* Fabianus *Superior, with respect to the Roman-Clergy*: which is a mistake: He calleth him simply *Præpositus* (which as I have above-shewed, was a Title given to Bishops & Presbyters) and if he had not called him their *Præpositus*, that doth not import *sole Power*. In an Epistle to *Rogatianus*, *Cyprian* insinuateth that he was *Ruler of the Church, ergo* he had *sole Power*: it is a Polish consequence: this may be said of every Elder of the Church.

He

He is ſcarce of Arguments when he is forced to falſifie *Cyprian*'s words: *qui in Eccleſia Præſidemus*: he tranſlateth, *who have the chief Power in the Church*; beſide that it is eaſie to diſtinguiſh between *chief Power*, and *ſole Power*; to which all are ſubject. Alſo *Præſumus* he turneth *govern the Church*. That the Biſhop is ſaid to be one, and *ſet over the Church*, may well agree either to a Pariſh-Miniſter, or the Moderator of a Presbytery, who was called ἐπίσκοπος. His next Eſſay is from the Biſhop's calling the Clergy *his Clergy*; for which he is at pains to cite many places. If this were conſtantly done (which was not) what doth it ſignifie: that manner of ſpeaking is as common among Presbyterians, as it was in *Cyprian*'s time: and it ſignifieth no more but Elders of the Church, whereof *Cyprian* was Paſtor; as the Elders of any Pariſh are called the Elders of ſuch a Miniſter: and Elders uſually call their Miniſter *our Miniſter*. It is a frivolous Queſtion, *by what Rule of Grammer, Rhetorick, Logick, or Politick could he be ſo called if he had no Power or Juriſdiction over them*. *A*. There is no Rule in any of theſe Faculties againſt it: tho' he have no *ſole Power*; If he have a ſhare of the Power that the whole hath over every one, and have the Conduct in managing that Power, by being their Moderator.

§. 57. He will let all this *paſs for a mere Præluſion*, not being *ſcant of Arguments*. Wherefore we muſt now expect what is more pungent: that is, the three Principles he had before proved ſo fully, *viz*. *The Biſhop being the principle of Unity; having ſupreme power: being the ſame with the High-Prieſt under the Old Teſtament*, do prove this Point. To this formidable Argument I oppone what hath been diſcouſed on theſe Heads: I leave the Reader to judge whether he hath fully proved theſe, or I have fully overturned them: Next he argueth from *Cyprian*'s ſaying *he could by his Epiſcopal power, Depoſe or Excommunicate a Deacon who had rebelled againſt him, and praiſing another Biſhop for ſo acting*, yea I ſhal allow him what he after ſaith, that *this power extended alſo to cenſuring of Elders*: Do not our Moderators uſually ſo practiſe

when

when there is cause: but not by their *sole Power*, but with the Consistory, or Presbytery. We Presbyterians may tremble at his next Blow: For he saith, he will *leave his Reader no imaginable scruple*. But these big words dwindle away into this feeble Argument; that *Cyprian might have censured* Felicissimus *and some with him, who first opposed his* Promotion, *and after he had taken them into favour, acted disorderly in receiving some of the lapsed, without the Praes, and the Presbytery*: of this case before: it is wholly insignificant here, unless he can prove, that *Cyprian* might do this by himself, without the Presbytery: which himself disowneth, as I shewed above: All that followeth (which is a Repetition of what he hath often alledged having little to say, when he braggeth of Superabundance) is already plainly answered. He is run a little weak; but he reinforceth his Arguments with Confidence and Repetitions.

§. 58. Hitherto he hath set forth his *Cyprianick Bishop* in his *Majesty, Absolute and sole Power, &c.* In his own particular Church; p. 78. he giveth us account of him, as he *stood related to the Catholick Church*: and here he expecteth matter enough for another Demonstration: which is a big Word in Disputation. We shall here also, by Divine Assistance, try his Strength; and tho' we will not brag of Demonstrations; yet shall endeavour to bring what Light and Strength the subject doth afford. His long Discourse about the *Colledge of Bishops*, I have read with Attention; and considered with what Application I am capable of, but cannot find his Demonstrations in it: yea cannot see wherein it is conducive to prove his point: only some Hints he hath interspersed that seem to have somewhat of Argument, which I shall consider, after I have taken a general View of the whole. He observeth that *all Bishops were Collegues, and made up one Colledge*. Next that *this Colledge was the principle of Unity to the Catholick Church*. Thirdly, that *the grand Concern of the Episcopal Colledge was to preserve and maintain the one Communion; which together with one Faith, made them capable to be the principle of Unity to the Catholick Church*;

Church: and that this was their work he proveth first, *they thought themselves bound to maintain Peace.* 2. *Every Bishop was a Member of this Colledge; and therefore great care was taken about their promotion.* 3. *He being promoted sent communicatory Letters to other Bishops, giving account of his* Promotion. 4. *If there was any Debate whether his Promotion was Canonical, the rest of the Bishops enquired into it.* 5. *If he turned Heretick, or Schismatick, he was turned out.* 6. *While he kept the Faith and Unity of the Church, he was encouraged, Consulted, Corresponded with, &c.* 7. *While he continued a sound Member of the Colledge, all Letters concerning the Peace and Unity of the Church, were directed to him.* Lastly, p. 87. *he observeth* (cum nota) *resist this Evidence* saith he, *if ye can*) *that every Heretical, or Schismatical Bishop, with all that retained to him, was* ipso facto *out of the Church*: At last, p. 88. He thinketh he *hath another Demonstration against my Notion of a Bishop in* Cyprian's *time*: *For how could a single* Presbyter, *or* Presbyterian Moderator, *have born such a part in relation to the Catholick Church, and her Unity and Communion.*

§. 59. I must Examine the Strength of this long Demonstration; and what he addeth to fortifie it: and then shall return to take notice of what he intermixeth in the several parts of it, in which our Debate may be concerned: For Answer then to this Argument, as it standeth. I deny the Assumption, *viz.* That what he hath here asserted cannot agree to a single Presbyter, or presbyterian Moderator. His three Assertions do well agree to every Presbyter; that is, Pastor of a Congregation: He is a Collegue to all Bishops, that is such Pastors. The meeting of such (either by their Delegats; or if they could all come together) is as capable to be the principle of Unity to a Provincial, or National Church, yea, to the Universal Church, as if so many Dioceſans should meet. It is as much the concern of these Presbyters, or Parish Bishops (and I hope they do as much mind it) to maintain one Faith and one Communion. Doth he think that our Ministers do not think themselves bound to maintain Peace: Or 2.

That

That there is little care taken about their promotion or giving them charge of the people, and admitting them to a ſhare of the Government. 3. Tho' it be not our cuſtom to ſend communicatory Letters of our ſettlement in a Charge; yet every Presbytery notifieth to the neighbouring Presbyteries the Name of him who is to be fixed in a Charge: that they may have opportunity to object: and the Names of all who are ordained, are recorded. 4. If a Presbytery ordain any perſon unduely, or if there be Competition, the ſuperior Judicatories enquire into it. 5. We alſo turn out, not only Heretical and Schiſmatical Miniſters; but them alſo who are ſcandalous in their Converſation, or ſupinely negligent in their Miniſterial Work. 6. We alſo encourage and admit to the Government, them that do well. 7. Letters that concern a particular Congregation, are, with us, directed to the Miniſter: theſe concerning the Presbytery, to the Moderator: we alſo caſt out bad Miniſters, and ſuch as adhere to them; if the Cauſe be weighty: but we uſe moderation to the people who are led away by Schiſmatical Miniſters, when their Separation is founded on leſſer miſtake: & if in this we differ from the *Cyprianick Age*, his Party ſhould not blame us; having taſted ſo much of our lenity. Let it then be conſidered how impertinent this whole Diſcourſe is, and how inſufficient to prove the Epiſcopacy of the *Cyprianick-Age* that he pleadeth for.

§. 60. He uſeth ſeveral enforcements of this Argument, *p.* 88, & 89. which I ſhall briefly conſider. 1. *The Colledge of Biſhops are ſtill conſidered as Church-Governours notoriouſly diſtinguiſhed from Presbyters.* *Anſw.* This diſtinction lay in the dignity that the declenſions of that time from Apoſtolick ſimplicity gave them; not in any Power that they had which Presbyters had not. 2. *A Presbyter was never called a Biſhops Collegue.* *Anſw.* If this were granted, ſuch a negative Argument, and that drawn from words, and ways of ſpeaking (which doth often vary) is not very concludent. I have ſhewed that the ſame Power is aſcribed to them, *ſee* §. 62. where the contrary of what he aſſerteth is ſhewed. 3. *We*

have

have no Veſtige of a Presbyterian Moderator in theſe times. *Anſw.* There was then a Moderator, who was called the Biſhop; who preſided in their Meetings: tho' there was no ſuch changing of the Moderator as is among us: that I have yielded: but the fixedneſs of the Moderator, and the parity of the Power are conſiſtent: tho' I deny not that the one made way for deſtroying the other; as After-ages did ſhew. 4. Our Author repeateth all the Acts of, and concerning Biſhops, that he had inſiſted on, and affirmeth that they could not conſiſt with a ſingle Presbyter, or Moderator, which I have above-denyed, and made the contrary evident. That he calleth *all the Acts of Government and Diſcipline his* (the Biſhops) *and his alone*; is to beg the Queſtion, for we deny it, and he ſhould prove it.

§. 61. I muſt now return to *p.* 78, and glean ſome Paſſages, which I was obliged to overlook, that I might have this long Argument (ſtretching from thence to *p.* 90.) intirely in view, and give a general Anſwer to it. He maketh *the Biſhop the Principle of Unity to a particular Church, and the Colledge of Biſhops the Principle of Unity to the Catholick Church; and Chriſt the Principle of Unity to that Colledge.* And addeth, *I hope not being a* Romaniſt, *you will not require that I ſhould prove the higheſt Step of this Gradation.* Here I obſerve *firſt*, the Diſcourſe is about a viſible Head, or *Principle of Unity* to the Church; which cannot be aſcribed to Chriſt. Wherefore this is wholly impertinent; or, if it have any ſenſe, it tendeth to make his Reader a *Romaniſt*, whom he ſuppoſeth not to be one already. For if the particular and Catholick Church, have a viſible *Principle of Unity*; and that which he maketh to be the *Uniting Principle*, have nothing that is viſible to make them one among themſelves, they who can receive his Doctrine about a *Principle of Unity*, will ſee a neceſſity of a *Pope* to unite the Biſhops, as much as of a Biſhop to unite the Presbyters. 2. If Chriſt be the *Uniting Principle* of the Colledge of Biſhops, why doth he not ſerve for the ſame uſe to Presbyters, yea, to all Chriſtians. And indeed he is the real *Uniting*

Principle to all; they only are in the Union of the Church, who cleave to his Doctrine, and obſerve his Laws; even tho' they ſeparate from the Biſhop who departeth out of that Way. 3. I deſire to know of him, why he thinketh the *Romaniſts* will put him to prove the higheſt Step of this Gradation, more than *Proteſtants* will? Doth any of them deny Chriſt to be the *Principle of Unity* to the Church? They only make the *Pope* his Vicar in this, becauſe they think ſuch an one is needful in the Church, who is viſibly Converſant among men: and doth not our Author ſuppoſe the ſame neceſſity of ſuch a viſible Uniter till he come to the Colledge of Biſhops, and he leaveth them Headleſs, that is, without a viſible Head. Where it may be rationally concluded, that this Doctrine is either *Popiſh* or palpably abſurd. The next thing I notice is, *p.* 79. he ſaith *all Chriſtians hold one Faith to be neceſſary to the Unity of the Church; but in* Cyprian's *time one Communion was thought as indiſpenſible: they held there is but one Church, and that this could not be without one Communion.* If by *one Communion*, he mean (for he walketh in a Cloud in this Matter, whether of Deſign or not, I know not,) that Communion of Saints which is an Article of the Creed; which conſiſteth in Union of them all with Chriſt, and Unity in Faith and Love, *&c.* I acknowledge the neceſſity of it, but I know not what reſpect it hath to Epiſcopacy, more than Presbytery. If he mean Local Communion, it is impoſſible either in the Catholick Church, or in the Dioceſs of a modern Biſhop. If he mean Communion by having the ſame Ceremonies and Government in the Church. Tho' I confeſs that is deſireable, and by all good means ſhould be endeavoured: (for we ſhould have no Ceremonies, but theſe which are of Divine Inſtitution, and the one Church Government that he hath appointed, ſhould be every where exerciſed,) yet there may be one Church, where this Communion is not: and if the *Cyprianick* Age was ſomewhat too ſtrick in this Matter, it was their Miſtake, (of which above,) but it is no Proof of Epiſcopacy, (in the ſenſe of our Debate,) to have been in that Age. And indeed,

indeed, if our Author maintain this Principle, he will (conſequentially to it) Unchurch moſt of the Reformed Churches, as the *Papiſts* do them all on the ſame ſcore: if by this *one Communion* he mean, that all Chriſtians muſt be United to ſome one Biſhop or other, which Biſhops agree among themſelves, and have Communion in the Epiſcopal Colledge; he will find hard to prove that *Cyprian* taught ſo. Yea, then there is no Communion in the Church, without an œcumenick Council of Biſhops, which we have litle hope to ſee: and many doubt that the World did ever ſee it: tho' there have been Councils ſo called; becauſe in them were repreſented all the Churches of the Empire. Further, if this was the Opinion of *Cyprian*'s time, how will he prove that theſe Biſhops in whom Churches were to be United, were any more than Pariſh Miniſters, and that the *one Communion* of that time, was more than that every Chriſtian muſt be the Member of one Church, where Chriſt's Ordinances are diſpenſed by a Biſhop, that is, a Miniſter of the Goſpel.

§. 62. Tho' I am not concerned to queſtion the Practice of Biſhops *ſending their Communicatory Letters, to ſignifie that they were promoted.* Yet I ſee no ſufficient Proof of it from the two or three Inſtances that he bringeth. It muſt be either a Law, or a great Train of Inſtances, in many ſeveral Nations, in greater and leſſer Churches, and under diverſe Circumſtances and Caſes of theſe Churches' that will bear the weight of ſo univerſal a Concluſion. But I paſs this: for it doth not much concern our main Queſtion. He will find it alſo hard to prove, that theſe Letters were ſent to all other Biſhops, (as he affirmeth, *p.* 80.) that had been a Work of no ſmall Labour: I ſuppoſe they did thus correſpond with ſome next adjacent Biſhops, or who were of ſpecial note; which we alſo do, as I ſhewed before. That there were *Metropolitans* in *Cyprian*'s time, he aſſerteth; and I deny it not. But they were but Moderators of the greater Meetings, (as the Biſhops were of leſſer ones,) of the Parochial Miniſters and Elders: as alſo were the *Primats*, and in *Affrick* eſpecially, the el-

deſt Biſhop or Miniſter, had this Dignity: but it was Præcedency, and Dignity, wherein they were above their Brethren, not Power and Authority, but this our Author toucheth but tranſiently; and ſo I ſhall not inſiſt on it: only I ask him; how do *Metropolitans*, in our modern ſenſe, agree with his Opinion that every Biſhop was *ſupreme*, and *had no Eccleſiaſtical Superior on Earth*: *See* §. 9. *p.* 82. where he is Diſcourſing of purging out a Heretical Biſhop; his thoughts ſeem to run ſomewhat muddy. He ſaith *the Colledge of Biſhops might do* (to him) *the equivalent of a formal Depoſition*; *they could refuſe him their Communion, and thereby exclude him from their Epiſcopal Colledge*: *and they could oblige all the Chriſtians within his Diſtrict to abandon him.* And becauſe he ſaw that his former Aſſertion of the ſupreme Power of a Biſhop, and his having no Eccleſiaſtical Superior, would be objected; he ſaith no Biſhop was ſuperior to another in point of Power and Juriſdiction. How to make all this hang together, is not eaſie to know. 1. To wreath the yoke of the Biſhop's Domination on the Church, he eſtabliſheth *Independency* among Biſhops: whereas no Reaſon can be given, why Pariſhes ſhould not be *Independent* on one another, as well as Provinces. I look on both theſe ſorts of *Independency*, as contrary to the Unity of the Church; and on *Subordination*, as of Natural and Divine Right. 2. If the Colledge of Biſhops had not formal Power to depoſe a Heretical Biſhop: by what Authority could they oblige the Chriſtians to abandon him, and to chooſe another: if he ſay, the Fundamental Law of ſound Faith and Unity; or as he ſpeaketh, of *one Faith, and one Communion*, obliged the Chriſtians to this. *A.* That is antecedent to the interpoſing of the Authority of the Epiſcopal Colledge, and they were obliged to it, tho' there were no ſuch Colledge. 3. That no Biſhop hath Power over another Biſhop, is no more than we ſay of Presbyters. But it is ſtrange that the Community of Biſhops, hath not formal and direct Power over every one of their own number; both with reſpect to his Communion with them; and with

reſpect

respect to his particular Charge; that maketh a wider door both for Heresie and Schism, and for Peoples Beeing, without remedy, under the Plague of bad Ministers, than any thing that Parity can be charged with. 4. The People are here left Judges of the Bishop's Heresie, and other Incapacitating ill Qualities; and so to determine whether they will leave him or not: the Colledge of Bishops can do no more but inform them, and tell them what they are obliged by the Laws of *one Faith, and one Communion* to do. 5. What if the Bishop will not leave his Charge, nor the People abandon him, hath Christ left no Ordinance in his Church, as a Remedy of this Case? The Colledge of Bishops cannot excommunicat him, nor them: that were to exercise formal Authority over him or them: if they then, will not yield to the Colledges Information or Advice, they may go on in their way without further Controlement. Thus we see that men will venture to ruine the Soundness, Peace, and Purity of the Church, that they may establish a Lordly Prelacy over the People of God. What he insisteth so much on, *p.* 86, 87. about directing publick Letters to the Bishops, and their being signed by them: is not worth our notice. We also count it regular for our Moderators to be so treated: but there was some peculiar Reason, why it was so punctually observed in that Age, because the *Præses* of their Meeting was fixed, and it was Interpretatively a Degrading of him, or questioning his Title, to do otherwise: but this importeth no superior Jurisdiction. He telleth, *p.* 87. that *every Hæretical, or Schismatical Bishop, and all who adhered to him, were* ipso facto, *out of the Church.* This I do not believe, for how shall a man be known to be Hæretical, till he were tryed and judged? His Proofs amount to no more, but that such were dealt with as out of the Church; and may be the manner of Process against them, is not mentioned: but such a negative Argument, will not prove that no more was done to cast them out: if that be the Episcopal course of Censure, wee intend not to follow it: and if that were the way in the *Cyprianick* Age, it maketh its Example less Venerable and Argumentative,

tive, but it saith nothing for the Bishop's *sole Power*: he saith p. 89. that *a Bishop never called a Presbyter his Collegue*. *A.* If it be understood of Presbyters without a Charge, there is Reason for it: he had no joynt Charge of the Congregation, we use the same way of Appellation. But if it be meant of a Moderator, with respect to the other Brethren; I answer we find Presbyters calling the Bishop *Brother*; as was noted before: Yea, *Concil. Carthag. 4. Canon.* 35. it is Decreed, that *tho' a Bishop in consessu Presbyterorum sublimior sedeat, intra domum Collegam se Presbyterorum cognoscat*. This, its true, was a litle after *Cyprian*'s time: but it was when Church-Domination was rather growing than decreasing.

§. 63. His strength is now far spent, when in the end of his Book, he wasteth so many words to set off an Argument, which is fitter to be smiled at, than laboriously answered. It is that *the Christian Bishops in* Cypria*'s time, made such a Figure in the Church, that they were the Chief Butt of the Malice of Persecutors: others might live in Peace at Home, when they were forced to Flee*. And he is at pains to prove this, which I think was never questioned in any Age of the Church. Their Station made them conspicuous, (for I deny not they were above Presbyters in Dignity,) their Parts (some of them) made them to be jealoused: their Zeal for God, made them hateful to the Promoters of Satan's Kingdom. But all this can never prove that they had the *sole Government* of the Church; nor that they had Jurisdiction over Presbyters, who were fixed in the Church, to oversee any part of it. Many Presbyters, Deacons, yea private Christians, who were eminent for Ability to confound the Adversary: for Zeal and Holiness; or for their Station in the World, were persecuted as well as their Bishops. That this is neither strange, nor concludent of Episcopal Power, is evident (not to fetch an Instance from far,) in the late Episcopal Persecution among our selves: the Ministers were mainly Hunted, Intercommuned, Imprisoned, forced to Hide or Flee: and the more eminent or zealous they were, the harder it went with them: yea, some who were freer than many

ny others, of what was thought Sedition, Diſorder, or Rebellion, yet were hardly uſed, for the Hurt that it was thought they might do to that which was the great *Diana* of the Aſcendent Party. And yet all this will not prove that they had, or pretended to, or were thought to have Juriſdiction over their Brethren. I do therefore deny the Conſequence, the Biſhops (ſome of them for I will not ſay it was the Lot of them all) were mainly perſecuted; *Ergo*, they and not the Presbyters had the Authority in Governing the Church. If *Decius* had ſuch *a dread of a Biſhop being ſetled in* Rome, *that he would more patiently have endured a Prince to rivall it with him for the Empire*: I am ſure he had not ſo much Cauſe as his Succeſſors had; from the Succeſſors of that Biſhop: Of no more Force is his Argument drawn from *Galienus directing his Edict to the Biſhops, when he ſtopt the Perſecution*: For we deny not that they had an eminent Station in the Church, and had a chief Hand in the Direction of her Affairs, whether ye conſider them as Pariſh-Paſtors, as they all were; or Moderators in greater Church-meetings, as ſome of them were. I have (as he willeth his Reader to do) *conſidered and weighed his Arguments without partiality, and in the Ballance of Juſtice*: But am not yet convinced, that the Schiſme that is in the Church is chargeable on us; but on his Party. Let the Reader judge whether of us have beſt grounds for our Opinion.

§. 64. He concludeth with making excuſe, from the bulk of his Book, that he doth not (as he firſt intended) *prove Epiſcopal Præemenencie to be of divine Right, as being Chriſt's Ordinance, and handed down to us from the Apoſtles in the conſtant Practice of the Univerſal Church*. This is the conſtant Cant of that Party; but I have met with none who was able to evince this tho' the learnedeſt among them; and not a few of them, have eſſayed it. If this Author ſhall think fit to make another Effort, as he declareth himſelf ready to do, if commanded by him to whom he writs this long Epiſtle) and if he bring any thing new; and not fully anſwered already: I doubt not but his Arguments will be examined to better purpoſe, than what is, or can be done, by ſuch a mean hand as mine is.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX.

AFter the former Sheets were almoſt Printed, I met with two Books at the ſame time, which I had not before ſeen: the one called *the Fundamental Charter of Preſbytry*, &c. with a Preface of 167 Pages, by a nameleſs Author: the other *an Inquiry into the new Opinions (chiefly) propagated by the Presbyterians in* Scotland; *with ſome Animadverſions on the Defence of the Vindications of the Kirk: by* A. M. *D. D.* This latter Book ſeemeth to have more of Argument than ſome others which I have ſeen from ſome *Scots* Epiſcopalians, if not from the ſame Hand: I have much deſired that our Debates might run in that more pure Channel; and rejoice to ſee any hopes of it. I am ſorry that now I have no time from neceſſary, urgent, and daily work, to conſider this Book ſo as to Anſwer it, if I ſhall not be Proſelyted by it. I intend to try it's ſtrength as ſoon as I ſhall have leaſure, if the LORD give Life and Health; and if it ſhall not be ſooner Anſwered by ſome other Hand; which I do much wiſh.

§. 2. The former of theſe two Books is expreſly levelled againſt an Act of the Parliament of this Nation; and is a direct Refutation of it: and therefore the Examination of it is out of my Road; and is moſt fit for ſuch as are converſant in the Affairs of State, and know the Politick which moved the Parliament ſo to contrive their Act. I do judge that he who ſhall undertake it will find no hard task. Beſide, the Presbyterian Miniſters did never look on *the Inclinations of the People* (which that Act mentioneth in it's narrative) as *the fundamental Charter of Presbytry*; however the Parliament might wiſely conſider it in their Conſultation and Determining, and mention it rather than what did more ſway ſome of them.

them. We always did, and do, found the Government of the Church by Parity, on Divine Inſtitution; and look on Prelacy as contrary to Chriſt's appointment.

§. 3. What I now undertake is, a tranſient view (ſuch as the Preſs haſtening to an end of the former Diſcourſe, will allow) of his Preface: which I hope may be lookt on as a due Refutation of it: nor can I imagine that any judicious and unbyaſſed man will judge, that ſuch a parcel of Stuff, deſerveth a laborious Examination: he hath need of a hardened Noſe who can inſiſt long in an exact Anatomatical Scrutiny into ſuch a rotten Carion. The Author hath out-done his Brethren (yea, and himſelf too) in Billingſgate-Rhetorick: he ſeemeth to be eminently gifted that way; to the ſilencing of who ever will oppoſe him; as ſome learned acute men have quickly had their Mouths ſtopt when the Tongues of ſome of theſe good Women have been let looſe againſt them. I had rather own in my ſelf all the dulneſs that he is pleaſed to impute to the man whom he deſigneth to expoſe, than enter the Liſts with him at that Weapon: and I do freely confeſs I am not qualified for it; and if I were, I ſhould think it unſutable to my Character (however mean) and inconſiſtent with a good Conſcience. Such impotency of Mind, and ſuch injurious Defamation, is not well conſiſtent with Chriſtianity; nor is ſutable to that Learning that is required in them who write Polemick Divinity: for, *Scolding is no Scholarſhip.* If his Adverſary was weak, he ſhould have knockt him down with ſtrong Arguments; not beſpattered him with dirty Revileings: the one would have ruined his Cauſe, the other but bedawb'd his Perſon; and it may be eaſily wiped off. If the Cauſe which my Adverſary owneth, need this Conduct, it is weak, and not worth contending for: if not; they who do ſo manage it are no credit to it.

§. 4. I refer the Reader who would have a view of this Author's Qualities more truly than he Characterizeth other men, to the *Biſhop of* Sarum's *Vindication*: where, if he be not aimed at, he is very plainly chaſtiſed in Effigie: for *G. B.* & *G. R.* ſeem to have been

been ſtung with the ſame kind of Serpent; if not the ſame individual. He had dealt more wiſely, if he had not convinced the Reader, by this management, of the very ſame ill Qualities in himſelf, that he ſo frankly attributeth to another. I am ſure he hath ſhewed litle Wiſdom in bringing Inſtances to prove his confident Aſſertions: had he contented himſelf with bold Saying, and quibling Inſinuations, of what he thinketh fit to load one with; ſome who know neither him, nor the perſon who is the Butt of his Malice, might have believed ſome part of what he alledgeth (they who know that perſon, however they cannot but ſee many Infirmities in him, have other thoughts of him; and indeed better than ever he could deſerve: and they who know this Author will judge that *his Tongue, nor Pen, is no Slander.*) But now his Proofs are ſo exceedingly unſuted to what they are brought for, that a litle attention may ſerve to improve them as Weapons againſt himſelf, and as Evidences of theſe things in himſelf which he deſigneth by them to faſten on another. I perceive he hath been at pains to read all that hath been written by *G. R.* on ſeveral occaſions; and what he thinketh fit to aſcribe to him; to ſee what he could pick up in theſe Papers wherewith he might reproach the Author: in which alſo he hath (innocently and without deſign) done him a Kindneſs: for if ſo critical an Eye could find no more to try his Skill upon in all theſe Writings, it is like there are many things in them which he could not Blame: for, *exceptio firmat Regulam in non exceptis.* It is a wonder if ſuch a perſon as he expoſeth could ſay ſo much to any purpoſe.

§. 4. I ſhall not inſiſt on his civility to the Parliament, and their Act; nor his modeſt Reflexion on himſelf; nor his great care expreſt to ſute his Diſcourſe to the *Engliſh-Nation*, even in the Words and Phraſes: nor on the account he giveth of the helps he uſed. Only I take notice how much pains he is at to prove (through 14 Pages) that the Book commonly called *Knox's Hiſtory* was not written by *John Knox*: I know none, who is much converſant in our *Scots* Affairs, who is contrary to him in this: and if *G. R.* was

ſo abſurd as to cite that Book under the Name by which it is commonly called; if it hence follow that he thought *John Knox* was the Author, let him paſs for as ignorant as our Author will have him to be: if this be no good conſequence, I hope it is no great evidence of this Author's Learning ſo to infer. That *John Knox* did not compoſe that Book, (tho' much of the Materials of it was taken from his Manuſcripts) hath been held by Presbyterian Brethren, before this Author went to School: neither do I know any of them who *are earneſt to have it believed that he wrote it*: yea, this Author himſelf citeth it always under the Name of *John Knox*; as he confeſſeth: and why might not another do ſo too, without debating about the true Author of it; which had been a needleſs digreſſion from his Purpoſe.

§. 6. After he has diſgorged a great deal of Gall againſt *G. R.* and declined him for an Antagoniſt (who hath the ſame averſion from entering the Liſts with him, unleſs he deal more like a Chriſtian, and a Diſputant) we might (but it is in vain) expect he ſhould be more compoſed: his Bile overfloweth through all his Sheets. He mentioneth ſome Paſſages in my Writings that he will not inſiſt on; only noteth them with a *Nigrum Theta*, as proofs of my unqueſtionable ignorance: they are, that I hold *Ruling-Elders, who are no Preachers, to be of Divine Inſtitution*; that *the Fathers, and Scripture alſo, owne them under the Name of Biſhops*. That *Patronages came not in till the ſeventh or eight Century, or later*: (where his own ignorance, or ſomewhat elſe, appeareth; the word is, they *were not ſetled* till then: it is well known, that many Uſages crept into the Church long before they were ſetled, either by Law, or univerſal Practice.) That, *moſt, and the moſt eminent of the Prelatiſts acknowledge, that by Chriſt's appointment, and according to the Practices of the firſt Ages of the Church, ſhe ought to be, and was govern'd in common by Miniſters acting in Parity*, (which is a groſs Miſrepreſentation; for that is ſaid of Chriſt's *equally intruſting* all his Miniſters with Power of Preaching and Governing: which is aſſerted and fully proved by the learned *Stillingfleet* in

in his *Irenicum*: and what followeth is that Author's own Words, not attributed to Christs appointment as unalterable, nor to the practice of the Church. Yet I shall not decline debating of both these with him, (tho' I say not they are the Opinion of Prelatists) That *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy was not ſetled in* Cyprian's *time*, &c. (What Ignorance is in this, is to be judged by the foregoing Book, That the *Decretal Epiſtles of* Anacletus *are genuine*, is neither aſſerted nor ſuppoſed, nor is any opinion given about them: only they are uſed as an antient Writing; and *argumentum ad hominem*. If this one Witneſs be caſt, we have enough beſide. That it is aſſerted, *Rational Def. of Nonconf. p.* 10. that *Epiſcopacy is not in any Proteſtant Church but in* England: is neither truly, nor with Candor ſaid; the Expreſſion is, *as in* England: and it is eaſily demonſtrable, that in no Proteſtant Church, it is in that height, or doth ſo entirely ſwallow up the Ruling Power of Presbyters, as it doth in *England*. If my Expoſition of *Jerom's toto orbe decretum eſt*, be Ignorant, or Erroneous; I muſt ſo abide, till this Profound Doctor Enlighten mine Eyes; which he hath not vouchſafed to do. Another of *Jerom's* Sayings, *Quid facit Epiſcopus*, &c. *exceptâ Ordinatione*: he ſaith my *Gloſs on it, hath been ſufficiently expoſed, Hiſt. of the General Aſſembly* 1690: and I ſay, it hath been ſufficiently Vindicated, in Anſwer to that, and other four Pamphlets; and *Def. of Vindic.* in Anſwer to the *Apology*, *p.* 24, 25. I ſhall now add, that very Expoſition of that Paſſage, was given by *Marſilius Patavinus*, cited in the end of the Preface to *Paul Bayn's Dioceſan's Tryal*: that Author lived about *Anno* 1324. In his Book called *Defenſor Pacis*, againſt the *Pope*; he hath theſe Words, (ſpeaking of that Paſſage of *Jerome*,) *Ordinatio non ſignificat ibi Poteſtatem conferendi, ſeu Collationem Sacrorum Ordinum; ſed OEconomicam Poteſtatem Regulandi, vel Dirigendi Eccleſiæ Ritus atque Perſonas, quantum ad Exercitium Divini Cultus in Templo: unde ab Antiquis Legum-latoribus, vocantur OEconomici Reverendi.* This we maintain to be competent to every Pariſh Miniſter; tho' not to the Elders of the Congregation, to manage

manage these in the Publick Assembly. I hope no man of sense, will reckon that Author an ignorant Person, of whom *Papir. Masson.* saith, *cujus Libri extant, non quidem Verborum, sed Rerum apparatu, prorsus Admirandi.* His Instance of my Ignorance, in Citing some Greek Authors, out of the Latine Translations of them, is so ridiculous, as it needeth no Answer.

§. 7. He next cometh to some Instances, that he seemeth to lay more Weight on. The first amounteth to no more but this, that I Cited *Chrysost.* out of *Bellarm.* and I had not *Chrysostome* then by me, (as our Author saith, he had not *Bellarmine*, when he wrote this Preface,) and answered *Bellarmine* and *Chrysostom's* Words, as he brought them: if he doubt, (as he seemeth to do,) whether I did faithfully Transcribe *Bellarmin's* Words, let him consult the Place: And now, when I have seen and considered *Chrysostom's* own Words, I am sure that χειροτονία, is not the same way ascribed to the Bishop alone, as διδασκαλία and πρεσβεία are to him, with the Presbyters: for he deriveth these from Christ's Institution, which he doth not pretend concerning that: nor indeed could he, seing he had said ἃ περὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει: he must then mean, that in his time, the Bishop had an Election, and may be, also Ordination to a superior Degree of Dignity, (which was without a superior Power,) or that to him, was committed the Performance of the Ceremonie in Clerical Ordinations, *viz.* Laying on of Hands: tho' I am sure, and have shewed, this was not the constant Practice. What our Author blameth in my sense of χειροτονία is fully Vindicated, *Gilles. Eng. Pop. Cer. P.* 3. *C.* 8. *Diggress.* 1. *P.* 164. His next Instance, is out of *Ration. Def.* &c. *p.* 199. where I prove the Peoples Power in Electing their Pastors, from *Act.* 14. 23. and that from the word χειροτονία, (not barely from the force of the word, as he, by Oversight, or Ignorance, mistaketh; but) by the force of the word, and it's Circumstances in that Place. If *Scapula* be not a good Voucher for the Signification of a Greek Word, both in Profane, and Ecclesiastical Writings, his Lexicon is little worth: if he be,

our

our Author has litle Judgment in declining his Authority; ſeing not one of the Inſtances he giveth of the word, is for Ordination; but generally, for giving Suffrage. If we Conſult Scripture, it is uſed *Act.* 10. 41. and 2 *Corinth.* 8. 19. in both which Places, it is uſed for Election. And its importing alſo Ordination, which I alledged, he is pleaſed to mock at: but thinketh not fit to take notice of the Grounds brought for that Interpretation, from the beſt Criticks: which I impute to his Unacquaintedneſs with that ſort of Learning; if we may be ſo bold, as to Queſtion the Skill of one, who ſo looketh down on other poor Mortals, as *Ignoramus's.*

§. 8. The next Proof of Ignorance is, I was bold to reprove one of my Adverſaries for commending Miniſters from their *underſtanding Chriſtian Philoſophy*: Hence our Auther ſpendeth about 10 Pages to prove, that that Phraſe was uſed by the Fathers: all which is eaſily granted, and was never queſtioned by any that I know. Only I ſtill think (and if that be to be ignorant, I cannot ſhun that blame) that however the Fathers did pertinently uſe it, and even at this time it may to very good purpoſe be uſed in ſome caſes, yet that in a time when Socinianiſm aboundeth, and when revealed Religion is ſo much decryed, by not a few, and all Religion is by ſome reſolved into Nature, and Humane Reaſon, the improvement of which is Philoſophy: I ſay in that caſe, it is not ſo very proper a Commendation of a Miniſter, that is taken from Chriſtian Philoſophy, as that which is taken from that knowledge of Divine Things, which is built on Revelation, as ſuperadded to what we have by Nature, and is attained by Ratiocination from ſcientifick Principles.

§. 9. He next thinketh fit to charge his Antagoniſt with Nonſenſe, the Inſtances are firſt, (*Animadverſ.* on *Stillingf. Irenic. p.* 30.) I had ſaid that all Ceremonies of God's Worſhip, are Worſhip themſelves. He ſhould have minded that it is there ſaid that the learned *Stillingfleet* ſaith the ſame, *Irenic. p.* 65. which I ſtill aver: and if he will not aſcribe Non-ſenſe to that unqueſtionably learned

learned Author, why may not such an one as I take shelter under his shadow. But if this Author had understood the Distinction, that I (and many more learned than I) have elsewhere cleared between Circumstances, Rites and Ceremonies, and that this last Sort, is peculiar to Religious Actions, and hath place in no other kinds of Actions, he might have understood, that such Actions are Religious, and Acts of Worship, and that they are true Worship, if instituted by Christ, and false, if divised by men. This cannot be judged Nonsense, by any who hath, with Judgement, lookt into the Controversie about Ceremonies; but it must be Nonsense to judge so of it. The Fetch, (as he calleth it) of Ceremonies that are in the place of *Competentes*, or *Catechumeni*; called in the same place *Candidate Ceremonies*, is no more Nonsense than other Metaphors are, if the Author be so ignorant, as to understand that Phrase literaly, it is his own Nonsense, and none of mine. The next peice of Nonsense is, that *the Affirmative of the second Commandment is, that we should worship God in the way that he has prescribed in his word*: *Rational Def.* p. 125. If this be Nonsense, I have for my Compurgators, the whole *Assembly of Divines* at *Westminster*, who in the Shorter Catechism, gave this Answer to the Question, *What is required in the second Commandment?* The second *Commandment requireth, the Receiving, Observing, keeping pure and entire, all such Religious Worship, and Ordinances as God hath appointed in his Word.* It is like this Author will not stick to charge that venerable Assembly with Error, but if he dare charge them with Nonsense, it is no great matter if poor I take a share with them. I am so dull as to understand as litle what Nonsense is in *owning the Lutheran Churches, as Sister Churches, and so having Communion with them, and yet refusing to joyn with them on their Instituted Ceremonies.* If any thing here look like Nonsense, it is from a Typographical Error, (which I confess that Book aboundeth with, the Correcting of the Press being commited by that Author to a negligent person, while himself was at the distance of some hundrdes of Miles) it is in the Manuscript *uninstituted*

stituted Worship: and is meant of parts of Worship not appointed by Christ, but devised by men: We can have Communion with them in owning the same Truths, (seing they own the same Fundamental Truths with us) and in these parts of Worship that Christ hath appointed; but we cannot joyn with them in worshiping God, by their Devices, and if they intermix these with instituted Worship, we must forbear Communion with them in both, rather than pollute our selves with uncommanded Worship: If this be Nonsense, I must bear that Imputation. Another Instance of Nonsense is, *Second Vindication*, p. 14. That *the two Governments (Presbytery and Monarchie) of Church and State, have suited one another many Ages, since the Nation was Protestant*: The Authors Antagonist had expressed his Wonder, *how Presbytery could suit Monarchie in the State*. I confess I was not so critical, as to impute to him, that he meant Presbytery in the State, and Monarchy in the State; (For I cannot discover Non-sense where it is not, even in an Adversary, as this sensible Man can;) And I plainly answered, *that these two Governments*; (*viz.* Presbytery in the Church, and Monarchy in the State) *did suit one another*. Whether the Non-sense is in my Expression, or in my Adversaries apprehension, let the Reader judge: Also whether a Handle is here given for a Cavil; or Malice, or Ignorance, hath supplyed it.

§. 10. Another thing wherein he hath a mind to find Non-sense, is *Animadvers. on* Stillingfleets *Irenicum*, p. 5. where the learned Dr. having asserted, that *where there are different Opinions and probable Arguments on both sides; if it be not a matter necessary to Salvation, it giveth ground to think, that that matter in Controversy was never intended for a necessary mean for Peace and Unity in the Church*: On this occasion, G. R. was bold to say, that *if things not necessary to Salvation, must needs be* thus *clearly revealed, much more this clearness is needful in things necessary to Salvation*. The Non-sense of this I cannot yet perceive: and I think this Author (not by his piercing Judgement, but by this tinctured Fancy) was the first that discovered it. And I cannot shun still to

think, that the Fundamental Truths ſhould be, and are revealed with more evidence, than the inferior Truths; and that the Lord would not have us to venture our Salvation, on that obſcurity of Revelation, that we may not venture the Peace of the Church on; if that were at Stake. But the beſt is, that the peace of the Church dependeth not ſo much on Oneneſs of Opinion, about ſome inferior Truths, as in honeſt endeavours after that, and in mutual forbearance where it cannot be attained. I am litle concerned in his not believing a Typographical Error, in a paſſage about the Decrees of God; which a Friend of his, (if not himſelf) had obſerved, and I had ſolemnly diſowned, and do ſtill diſowne, as what I never thought, ſpoke, nor wrote: It ſeems he meaſureth the veracity of others by his own. But he will prove what he affirmeth; *That Book was Re-printed in* England, *without Alteration, or Correction*; *Ergo* it was the Authors, not the Printers Error. A wiſe Conſequence indeed: if it went abroad with that Error, (as I deny not it did) it is no wonder it was Re-printed with it: but that it was ever *Re*-printed, is more than I know, or ever heard before: if he will not believe me in this, I hope ſome others will. He next ſetteth the black Mark of Non-ſenſe, on the Arguments I bring againſt *a ſtinted Liturgy of mans Compoſure*: *Rational Def.* p. 226. I can ſee nothing but tollerable Senſe, and ſome ſtrength of Reaſon, in theſe Arguments; when I review them after many years: And our Author thought not fit to diſcover it to us, and therefore they muſt even ſtand as they were. Only this great Judge of Non-ſenſe, ſheweth us that *the Lords Prayer is a ſet Form and diſowned by Presbyterians, and therefore that muſt be here* included: Anſwer, that Prayer (if a ſet Form; that is, if it be enjoined to be rehearſed in publick Worſhip) is not a ſet Form of mans deviſing, and therefore falleth not under the Arguments that he oppoſeth. Neither do Presbyterians diſown that Prayer, but uſe it as a Directory for Prayer, and if any will repeat the words in ſolemn Worſhip, they do not cenſure them. He hinteth, (tho' ſo confuſedly, that I cannot make Senſe of his Refuta-

tion

tion of Non-ſenſe) that *we are* Quakers, *becauſe againſt Liturgies.* We find no Liturgies in the Apoſtolick Church; and yet they were no *Quakers*: if all praying without Book were *Enthuſiaſm*, (as he ignorantly inſinuateth) many Epiſcopal men muſt be ſuch, for they do not always uſe the Book. His retorting the Argument on *extemporary Prayer*, is ſtrangely wide, and hath been often anſwered: But this Author's buſineſs is not to clear Truth, but to run down a certain perſon whom he hath in chaſe: *Extemporary Prayer* impoſeth neither Matter, nor Frame, or Compoſure, on the Hearers, and Joyner, further than Nature it ſelf maketh neceſſary, where people pray together: but ſet Forms do.

§. 11. Yet more Non-ſenſe: his Antagoniſt *ſpeaketh of the Popiſh Church* of Scotland, *and of the* Proteſtant Church, *alſo often of the Epiſcopal and Presbyterian Church there, whereas the Church is but one*: Which this Author is at much pains to expoſe: but by miſhape, expoſeth himſelf in ſo doing: I liſt not to contend about words, whether you call a divided Church (as *Scotland* was while partly popiſh, and partly Proteſtant: and novv is vvhole partly Presbyterian and partly Epiſcopal) two Churches, or one Church rent in two peices; I think is not material, I ſee no Non-ſenſe in either way of ſpeaking: Both Parties or Churches if permitted muſt have their Government, and Governours, neither is it fit that they ſhould rule that Church, or part of the Church to which they are oppoſite, and which they would deſtroy. It is wholly beſide this purpoſe that he bringeth in, of my blaming *Dr. Stillingfleet* for making *the Unity of the Church of* England, *conſiſt, in two Convocations* (which our Author doth ſo groſly miſtake for the Upper and Lower Houſes of one Convocation, whereas that Author doth make two Convocations in two diſtinct Provinces, p. 300) for that is one Church united in it's parts, not divided into Parties as the Church we ſpeak of. And it's leſs intelligible, how that ſhould *have two Heads*, than in this caſe: Why two Parties may not be called *two governing Bodies*, in a divided Church, I cannot yet underſtand, for all his Story of the Platonick Monſter:

That *no Head is mentioned*, why ſhould he wonder; unleſs he think a viſible Head of the Church in a ſingle perſon is neceſſary; in ſuch Metaphorick Speeches, there is no matter of moment; whether ye call the governing Part of a Church a Body, or a Head: but enough of this quibling on this Head.

§. 12. Our Author's next Eſſay, is to ſet forth his Antagoniſt's *ill Nature*: in which Diſcourſe, every one may ſee, how manifeſtly and fully he ſetteth forth that Temper of Mind in himſelf, which he blameth in another: moſt of the Paſſages he inſiſteth on, were written againſt ſome Pamphlets, which contain the moſt falſe and injurious Imputations, and that not againſt a Perſon only, but againſt all the Presbyterians without Diſcrimination: yea, againſt the whole Nation, in it's Repreſentative, the Parliament; and many of theſe Aſſertions are proved to be falſe, and if a certain Author, by a Book which gave leſs occaſion, was by every Line, provoked to *the Indecency of Paſſion*, what wonder, if juſt Indignation was warmly expreſſed againſt ſuch Abuſive Treatment. If I have called any thing *Lies*, *Railing*, *Saucineſs*, *Impudence*, which was not ſo, I am content to underly the juſt Sentence of unbyaſſed men, but this Author and his Complices, take a Boundleſs Liberty to Reproach, and if they be told of it, they are Clamorous beyond Meaſure. It is not inconſiſtent with all that Civility that is due to men, to give things their true Names, eſpecially where the Rank and Behaviour of the Perſons we deal with, plead no extraordinary Reſpect. He miſtaketh, when he ſaith, that *I knew, that the Author of the Memorial was dead, before I anſwered his Book*: I do not to this day, know who was the Author of it. What was ſaid about giving up King *Charles* the firſt to *England*, ſhould have been refuted by Reaſon, not by Quibling: I have no Anſwer for ſuch Arguments: neither have I time to examine how fairly all the words are cited, which he adduceth, nor to ſhew on what occaſion, or on what neceſſity they were written: what he repreſenteth as ſpoken of the Prelatiſts, is injuriouſly blamed, it was ſpoken of a Party of them, (who are

but

but few,) who reproached the Presbyterians in general, and in the most universal Terms; which never was my way against them.

§. 13. If any thing hath dropt from my Pen, which may be judged Uncivil, or short of due Respect toward the Learned, and Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, I am ready to crave him pardon, for I designed the contrary: what this Author chargeth me with that way, is partly false, as what he citeth out of the *Preface to Animadv. on Irenic.* for both the Prefaces, (I have seen one at some Copies, and another at other Copies,) were written by another hand, without the knowledge of the Author: partly they are fouly misrepresented; to give an Instance: this Author saith, that I said of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, p. 18. that *for the most part he doth nothing, but* magno conatu nihil agere. This is misrepresented: I said that he insisteth most on things not controverted, and thence inferred the blame mentioned. It is one thing to charge one directly with an Opinion or Practice: and another, to make an Inference from it: seing many do or say that, the ill Consequence of which they do not observe, but will disowne. His other Citations are but a just Censure one some Passages of that Learned Author's Writings, which I was examining, which cannot be shunned in Polemick Writings: to call that a *Contradiction* that I make appear to be such, is no Injury nor Breach of that Civility, that is due to a Stated Adversary: many things are fair enough in open War, which were not so in a State of Peace. This Author is yet more injurious, in expounding all that I have said of a few men of imbittered Spirits, among the Prelatists, who have in their Writings reproacht the Presbyterians, and imputed to them, things that they are innocent of, or abhor, applying all this, (I say) to all them who are of the Episcopal Perswasion; or to the Party in general, as that they are *Esaus*, *Serpents*, *Spiteful*, *&c.* I challenge him to prove what he saith: I deny it: if I have said any thing of *Immorality among the Clergy*, it is too evident, tho' I know some of them are innocent, and lament it. What he citeth

as

as ſpoken againſt the *Church of* England, *and her Clergy*, is either what is in Controverſie between us, and them: I have been ſo bold, as to call their *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies Superſtition*, and to mention what is the Native Concomitant of Superſtition, that *men will be wiſer than Chriſt or his Apoſtles*. This is no more a Crime, than it is a Fault to be oppoſite to their way. What is ſaid of *Immoralities, and Inſufficiency for the Miniſtery, and other Corruptions that are among them*, is not chargeable on me, yea nor on Presbyterians alone, but it is the Complaint, of the beſt among themſelves, ſee *the five Groans of the Church, and Mr.* Bold's *Serm.* Theſe Authors were truly Sons of the Church of *England*; thouſands among them, complain of theſe things, who yet adhere to that Communion. I might well diſowne that Principle of *Sentencing, & Executing Kings by their Subjects*, about which ſome of the Church of *England* had informed forreign Divines, as the Principle and Doctrine of Presbyterians: becauſe the Generality of Presbyterians in *Scotland*, (very few excepted, and theſe turned Independents after,) ſhewed their Abhorrence of that Fact committed on King *Charles* the firſt, ſo they did in *England*, and ſome of them ſuffered Death, for owning his Son. Is it Incivility to the Church of *England*, that I thought, at the time of the late Revolution, it *was fit for Parties to put in their Claim, for what they thought the way of* GOD, that it might be judged of by them who had Authority? if the Church of *England* think, we ought not to mutter againſt the Corruptions of their way, nor ſeek a Remedy in an orderly and legal way, they may know that we pretend to no ſuch Civility, as is inconſiſtent with Faithfulneſs to the Truth, and Ordinances of Chriſt. We are for the Purity of the Church of *England*, and for her Peace too, ſo as not to meddle with her without our Sphere: but if ſpeaking, or writing for the good way that we owne, do diſquiet her, with reſpect to her Corruptions, we muſt be excuſed. It is a wiſe Aſſertion, *he exhorteth his Readers to purge the Church of* England, *&c.* I exhorted none to this Attempt, but in their Station, ſuch as many have not:

not: his Expreſſion ſoundeth, as if I had ſtirred all up, that ſhould read this Book, to fall on the Church of *England*, and pull her down.

§. 14. *Impudence* is the next Epithet, that he laboureth to fix on the man of his Wrath. Inſtances are; It is abſcribed to *Cunning*, that their Books reproaching the Presbyterians were ſpread in *England*, but hard to be found in *Scotland*: which he imputeth to *want of Liberty for Printing ſuch Pieces in* Scotland, *and hazard in importing them*: but it is ſufficiently known, that many Books of that ſtrain have been imported, and none ſeized (that I hear of) but one Parcel, which was of another ſtrain. Next it is *Impudence* to aſſert the *Loyalty of Presbyterians*. *Anſw.* It is more *Impudence* to aſcribe to Presbyterians, what was the Practices of ſome few, with which the far greateſt part, neither did, nor would concur. What was ſaid on this Head, was alſo proved; and it is *Impudence* to put ſuch a Mark on any Aſſertion, and yet not attempt to anſwer the Arguments brought for it. Another *Impudence* is to ſpeak of the *Harmleſneſs of Presbyterians*, *and that they are no Perſecutors*. And *that any one of many of them ſuffered more Hardſhips, and Barbarous Cruelty, than all the Eſpiſcopalians have endured*: the *Impudence* of this, he proveth very learnedly: *how could one man ſuffer the deprivation of five or ſix hundred Livelyhoods*. That there were ſo many Epiſcopal Miniſters turned out, (I ſuppoſe theſe he meaneth) I know not; but it is not a wiſe compariſon, of one man to have ſo many Families to maintain on nothing, and each to have his own: I affirm that one man who ſuffered *Torture*, *Intercommunning*, *was forc'd to lodge in Dens and Woods*, *and in daily hazard of his Life*, *who was ſold for a Slave in the remote places of the Earth*, ſuffered more (tho' his loſs of Money did not amount to ſo great a Sum) than all they did. I find nothing in what followeth to diſprove what I had ſaid, and therefore paſs to another piece of *Impudence*, (which yet is a repetition of what he had ſaid before) that Presbyterians are no Rebels. To prove this he (very pertinently) alledgeth a Contradiction between

between first *Vindic. ad Q.* 2. §. 3. where it is said that *Episcopacy raised a Tumult*, and §. 5. *they* (the Episcopal men) *raised no Tumults.* (This last is *ad Q.* 3. §. 5.) *Answ.* The former is spoken (as plainly appeareth to them who will see) of the War between the King and Parliament. The other of such Tumults as our Author chargeth the Rable with, and it is expresly said that they did what they could to raise a War. Here then is that horrible Contradiction that he findeth, or fancieth: a War managed by potent Armies and for a long time, is in one place called a Tumult; and yet Scuffles among a confused Rout, which are soon over, are distinguished from such a War. Here is neither Contradiction nor Impudence: The *Impudence* that followeth is injuriously imputed to me (it is vindicating the Presbyterians from being *Rebels*) for what himself seemeth to applaud in other more modest persons, he might find frequently said by me. But if it be Impudence to deny Presbyterians to be *Rebels*, what kind of quality must he be of who chargeth them with it, while his own Party is guilty of Actions of the same nature, and were as universally engaged in them. What hath lately fallen out, might teach him either to justifie what he so freely calleth Rebellion, or to lay the blame of it on *Protestants*, and not *Presbyterians* only: and then if no share of it fall on himself, let us know what Party he is of.

§. 15. He next challengeth some Insinuations, as if the *Presbyterians in* Scotland *were the only* Protestants; which cannot be inferred from any Words he citeth. Neither can it be interred that I thought, or said that *the Gospel was not preached but by the* Presterians. One word he layeth weight on, that *if the* Presbyterians *had not used the Indulgence given to them and* Papists; *these would have occasion to mislead* People, *without any to oppose them.* None who had a mind to understand Words as they are plainly meant, would so construct this Passage; such universal Expressions most frequently suffer a Limitation: also in that case they had done what in them was, that none should oppose Popery: as if a Batallion in an Army flee, they act such a part as tendeth to hinder any opposition

ſition to be made to the Enemy. Beſide all this, tho' there were ſome privat Epiſcopal Miniſters appear'd faithful in this Caſe: it is well known how litle moſt of the Biſhops, and the generality of the Clergy appeared, and how they that did ſpeak any thing that way, were diſcouraged by ſome Biſhops. I wiſh he had better cleared to us, how abſurd it is to ſay, that the true Proteſtants in the Nation were for the late Revolution, than by telling us, that *being againſt it was no Popery*: moſt men think it was too much to favour it, and was a defect in that Zeal that ſhould have, in ſuch a Juncture, been ſhewed againſt it. The *ſecret Inſtructions from Holland* that he giveth as the Cauſe of *Presbyterians complying with the Diſpenſing Power*: I never heard of them, but from that Epiſtler whom he mentioneth: and I could anſwer nothing to it but by denying it: and now when he calleth for an Anſwer to it, I ſay, *Firſt*, Presbyterians did never comply with the Diſpenſing Power, but groaned under it as a Grievance: their uſing the Indulgence could not be ſo conſtructed, as I have elſe-where ſhewed. *Secondly*, I ſolemnly declare that I know nothing to this day of theſe *ſecret Inſtructions*. *Thirdly*, What moved ſuch Presbyterians as I was acquainted with to ſcruple uſing the Indulgence at firſt, and to accept it at laſt, was, that ſome Conditions and Limitations, that they could not ſubmit to, were left out in the laſt Edition of it. The *Villany* that he chargeth the Presbyterians with, in *Addreſſing King* James *for his Indulgence, while they were on Intrigues to ſupplant him*, muſt be charged on them who were ſo guilty: I knew of no ſuch Intrigues, nor any ſuch deſign then on foot, tho' now I perceive that ſuch Deſigns were then hatching: neither can I name one perſon among all that accepted of the Indulgence who knew of ſuch Deſigns.

§. 16. He next bringeth inſtances of *Impudent Shifts* uſed by *G. R.* when he, or his Cauſe is put to it. The rabbled Miniſters were not deprived of their Poſſeſſions (I mean Stipends) by an Act of Parliament (as he alledgeth,) but thruſt from their Places by the Rabble; and the State judged that they could not relieve them without palpable Inconvenience; and becauſe of the notoriety of the Scandals of not a few of them which had been ſo outed;

(as appeareth from the then Prince of *Orange*'s Declaration,) on which followed the loss of their Benefices. What the State did, they can best give Reasons for. I never defended what the Rabble did that way. For what is said of *Parliaments calling King* James's *Retirement from* England, *his Abdicating the Government*: that is plain to be meant of the Parliament of *England*: for tho' it was written by a *Scots-man*, it was said of *English-Affairs*: of Retirement from *England*, not from *Scotland*: wherefore here is no Impudence, (unless on his own side,) tho' the *Scots* Parliament speak nothing of Abdication. This, and what followeth, is picking a Quarrel without cause given. The long Story he hath of the Viscount of *Dundee*'s Plot, and the Forces that came from the West to defend the Convention, containeth such Matters of Fact, as he contradicteth what is confidently affirmed by them who were on the Place, and had occasion to know these things, as well as he; and are fully as credible persons as he is. Let the Reader judge who deserveth most Credit. I was Witness to none of these things: but shall give my Vouchers, if duely called to it: if he can do the like, let unbyassed Men judge of the whole History. If I had said *the whole Nation knoweth the whole of this Passage to be true*, as he affirmeth that the whole Nation knoweth it to be a Figment; I might have been branded with *Impudence*, on better ground than any thing that he hath brought to prove his Charge against me.

§. 17. What was said against Dr. *Strachan*'s Defence, he spendeth many Words upon it: on which I observe a few things. *First*, I expressly referred that Objection to be Answered by some seen in State-Affairs; it being Political rather than Theological. 2*ly* That I pleaded an *Inter-regnum* in the time of the Rabbling, and would not allow it in the Dr's Case, is no inconsistency: for in the first case the Exercise of Government was impossible; in the other there was actual Exercise of it. 3*ly* When it was said *the Representative of the Nation had owned* William *as their King*: it was not meant (as he hath a mind to understand it) as complexly such; but as Exercising the Supreme Regal Power, and designed to be compleatly King. I could give Scripture-Instances of such manner of speaking of Kings: if it were fit to enlarge as much on this

this Head as he doth. 4*ly* If it was not a Contempt of the Authority of the Nation, to diſobey the Command of it's higheſt Power for the time, even tho' one ſhould attempt to give Reaſons (unleſs theſe Reaſons were alſo ſufficient, of which none of us are Judge) let any give Sentence. 5*ly* He ſubtilizeth the Diſtinction too much between being King, and exerciſing the Regal Power: but to help out his fine Notion, he behoved to alter the Phraſe, putting *Right to Exerciſe* for *Exerciſing* it ſelf: I hope theſe two may be diſtinguiſhed; and that there may be not only a Phyſical, but a Moral impediment, for a time, of a Moral Right. His Notion of *Exerciſing the Regal Power before taking the Oath, and that there is no Obligation to take the Oath before the Coronation*; I cannot yield to; but leave to Stateſmen, and Lawers to Debate it with him. I ſay the ſame of his Diſcourſe of Hereditary and Elective Kings.

§. 18. That I called *K. J. our lawful Soveraign*, he ſaith, *was a ſtriking at the Root of the preſent Settlement.* Anſwer, if I had ſo called him, with reſpect to the time of the preſent Government, what he ſaith were true. But to ſay that he was ſo before this Government had it's being, and before the Nation in its Repreſentative had found and declared the contrary, is far from that blame. Next, he unfairly repreſenteth what I had ſaid, that *Epiſcopacy cannot be reſtored*: I hope it never ſhall, and I am ſure it never can, without croſſing the Inſtitution of Chriſt. But whether the reſtoring of it be conſiſtent with the Civil Rights and Priviledges of the Nation, as things are now ſtated, I leave it to State-men and Lawers to diſcuſs. His Commendation of the *Cameronians*, and blaming me for ſpeaking to their Diſadvantage, is not out of kindneſs to them, but in *odium tertii*; that he might make the ſober Presbyterians (for I cannot be bantered out of that Diſtinction) more hateful, as being worſe than they. I ſhould think it loſt time, to examine his quibbles about the Presbyterian Miniſters not preaching ſo much as he and his Complices thought was meet againſt the Rabling: theſe things were ſufficiently declared againſt by ſome, and that where ſuch Diſorders were moſt rampant and regnant: but Preaching could not Stem that Tide,

many of these men would hear none of us, nor will they to this day (tho', through mercy, not a few of them are reclaimed) and some who listned to other Doctrine, would not hear that. He hath a wise inference, I had said, *these courses were preached against both before they were acted, for preventing them: and after for reproving them*; *Ergo*, saith he, *it was a consulted and deliberat Politick; and the Ministers were privy to it; and yet did not warn the poor men, that they might have escaped being rabled*: I shall not give this its due Name; as he frequently giveth ill and undue Names to my Words. Ministers knew an inclination to Disorders in some, that they went beyond their Stations, by an ill guided Zeal: and this they warned against, yea, and some Presbyterian Ministers did protest against all these exasperated men, when they beheld it: But that they knew Designs for these Disorders in particular, is false, and doth not follow from what was said; He saith, he can name more than one or two of the first Rank of sober *Presbyterian Ministers*, (such a Blunder and Repugnancy in me would have been called *Ignorance*, *Non-sense*, *Impudence*, and what not) who advised to these Courses. I solemnly declare I know not any of them, and if I did, I should blame them.

§. 19. He cometh next to *Contradictions*: some of which are fancied; others are real; but of his own making, by mis-citing words; One is I have said, *where there are Bishops the Presbyters have no Power*, in another Book, *we do not say that Bishops take all Power from Presbyters*. Any who will be at the pains to consult the places that he citeth, will find that the first speaketh of Governing Power; the other speaketh of Power in General, which comprehendeth preaching Power, but it is there expresly said, that they take away all Governing Power: Where is then the Contradiction: Next it is said, (he knoweth not where it seems; nor do I) that *King James's Indulgence was against Law*. And yet *2d Vendic.* p. 43. *the Parliament had given the King such Power*. The first Assertion I find not; another Assertion that to him will infer it, is, *the Law was for publick Meetings*, *Ergo*, privat Meetings were against Law; It is a pitiful Consequence, Where Liberty is allowed,

(as

(as now in *England*) the Law is for both ways. Wherefore the ſecond Aſſertion maketh no *Contradiction*. But if both had been ſaid, there are juſt Laws, and unjuſt: which may without a Contradiction in the Aſſertion, be ſaid to contradict one another. This Diſtinction removeth alſo the next pretended *Contradiction*, between a *Forefeiture being unjuſt, that the Authority of the Nation laid on, and Miniſters having no legal Right to their Stipends, when the Authority of the Nation have determined otherwiſe*; Parliaments may both do right, and do wrong. Another *Contradiction* he fancieth: *Animadv. on Stillingf. Irenic.* It is aſſerted that *all Miniſters having got equal Power from Chriſt, they cannot ſo devolve their Power on one of themſelves, as to deprive themſelves of it: their Power being not a Licenſe only, but a Truſt.* This he thinketh *is contradicted indirectly, by delegating Members to the General Aſſembly.* To this I anſwer, Delegation to the General Aſſembly, is a Temporary, tranſient thing, for the exerciſe of one or a few Acts: and neceſſity doth warrant it, ſeing the Miniſters of a whole Nation, cannot meet, without leaving almoſt the whole Nation deſtitute of Preaching, and other Ordinances, for a conſiderable time. This is not to be compared with devolving of the Power of the Miniſters of a whole Province on one Biſhop, who is perpetually (*ad vitam aut culpam*) to exerciſe the whole power of the Church, in all the Acts of it; ſo as all the reſt are deprived of it, and cannot exerciſe it, nor give account to God for the Management of it. The one is very conſiſtent with that Parity that Chriſt made in communicating Church Power to his Servants, the other is not. He ſaith alſo, that I *contradict the former Poſition directly*, in *true Repreſentation: & 2d Vindic. by allowing the taking ruling Power from the prelatical Clergy.* Beſide the Neceſſity, and unſettled State of the Church in theſe Places, brought for juſtifying this Conduct, which he rather mocketh at than ſolidly anſwereth, I there at length inſiſted, to ſhew that there is no inconſiſtancy between this, and our principle concerning Parity: I need ſay no more, till he anſwer what is already ſaid.

§. 20. Another Contradiction he will needs make, between my

my *disowning some Grounds of Separation in* England, *and owning the same in* Scotland. The one in my *Rational Defence against Dr.* Stillingfleet, the other in my *second Vindic. of the Church of* Scotland, this he prosecuteth with a great deal of Clamor: what strength is in his Discourse, let us now try. I hope I shall be found *semper idem*, for all this noise. Three *Grounds of Separation* he mentioneth, wherein this *Contradiction* lyeth, first *Episcopacy*. *Answer*, I said the setting up *Episcopacy* in England, *was not a sufficient Ground for People to forbear hearing of the Word in their Parish Churches*, I say the same with respect to *Scotland*. I said *Episcopacy was a good Ground for Ministers to withdraw from Church Judicatories, where they must (at least interpretatively) own that Authority*: I say the same of *England*. If he can find any thing in my words, that doth import any more than this, I shall owne a *Contradiction*, and the shame that it may infer. The second is *Episcopal Ministers were Usurpers, or Intruders*. The third is *they had not the Peoples Call*. I am sure, I never made these to be two distinct things: but this Author's subtile Wit, hath divided them. Here I cannot own either *Contradiction* or *Contrariety*. I approved the Conduct of many People in *England*, who by a *tacit, and after Consent, owned these men, as their Pastors, and heard them, tho' they did not joyn with their unwarranted Ceremonies*: I never condemned the same Practice in *Scotland*; but approved it by my Practice, and Doctrine. Only I pleaded, that what ever might be said of their not giving Consent, (which was also the Case of many in *England*,) they could not be Charged with Separation, while these men were obtruded on them, against the Laws of the Gospel, especially when they might hear their own lawfully called Ministers, tho' in a Corner. I find no *Contradiction* here, neither in what he saith about the *Covenant*, which I still think never made any new Duties, or sins for the matter; but was a superadded Tie to former Moral Obligations. I said indeed that the *Covenant National*, and *the Solemn League*, made setting up of Episcopacy more sinful than before: but I never said, that either it made Episcopacy sinful, where it was not so before:

before: nor that it made owning of it ſuch: tho' I am ſure it aggravated the ſin of both.

§. 21. His next Effort is to expoſe my Rejecting the Teſtimony of ſome, who were brought to Atteſt the *Rabbling*: but in his way, (I know not what Freak took him,) he Digreſſeth to conſider the *Preface to Animadv. on* Stillingf. *Irenic.* which he will needs have to be written by the Author himſelf, on which he diſcanteth after his own manner, that is, not very Learnedly, nor Convincingly; I aſſure him, and (if he will not be aſſured, he having no great Eſteem of my Veracity,) I can aſſure the Reader, that the Author neither wrote that Preface, nor what is in the Title Page, nor knew that the Book was Printed, till after it was done; but was at 300 Miles diſtance from where it was done. The Metaphorical *Death*, ſpoken of in it, taken from the *Engliſh* Phraſe, of being *Dead in Law*, as the Nonconformiſt Miniſters then were, was but a ſorry Subject for a Learned Divine to practiſe upon, but he had a mind to write much, and had little to ſay, tho' he often pretendeth to have great Plenty of Matter. It is true I did, and do Queſtion the Truths of many Circumſtances, whereby the *Rabblings* were aggravated: and tho' he is pleaſed to ſay, that *the whole Nation knoweth them*, I affirm the Generality of the People, where theſe things were ſaid to be Acted, know the contrary: let the Reader, who hath not occaſion to enquire into the Matters of Fact, believe as he ſeeth Cauſe, or ſuſpend his Belief. I did never defend, nor deny the Hardſhips that ſome of the Epiſcopal Clergy met with from the Rabble: only I ſaid, and I inſiſt in it, that they were Repreſented moſt Diſingenuouſly in ſeveral Parts, and Circumſtances of them: his Vouchers I reject, (I mean ſome of them,) ours he rejecteth; which is ordinary in ſuch Contendings, wherefore unleſs the thing could come to a Legal Tryal, every one muſt believe as he ſeeth Cauſe. That *I rejected by the Bulk all the Matters of Fact*, is falſe, and injurious. I did acknowledge ſeveral of them, and condemned them as unaccountable Diſorders. It is a fooliſh Inference, *no man can be a fit Witneſs before a Court*, becauſe we are not to believe all the Stories that

that men tell of themſelves, or their Friends. That I *had my Informations in theſe things moſtly from Rabblers themſelves*, is falſly aſſerted, as may be ſeen by any who Impartially conſider the *ſecond Vindication*. His expoſing that *ſecond Vindication*, becauſe I *had the Accounts of Matters of Fact from other hands, and was not Eye, nor Ear-Witneſs to them*, is odd; for what Hiſtorian is there, who may not be, on the ſame Account, blamed. The Book he ſpeaketh of, *Account of the late Eſtabliſhment of the Presbyterian Government, by the Parliament*, I have not ſeen, nor heard of it before. I *thanked the Parliament*, in the Preface to my Sermon before them, *for their Act, Eſtabliſhing Presbyterian Government*, can any wiſe man thence Infer, that I commended whatever was beſide Incorporated into that Act? Therefore all his long Diſcourſe on that head, is impertinent. Another terrible *Contradiction* is, I ſay *Field Meetings were ſometimes neceſſary*: and yet *they were Condemned by the Wiſeſt and Soberest Presbyterians*. If I had ſaid they were in all Caſes ſo Condemned, he might have Inſulted: but may not I *always*, that is at all times, be of Opinion, that a thing ſhould not be done, as I ſee it often done, and without Neceſſity, and yet think that there may be a Caſe of Neceſſity, where it may be done; this is to Cavil, not to Reaſon.

§. 22. The Envenomed Words, in ſome Pages that follow, wherewith he Concludeth his Preface, and theſe of the ſame Sort, wherewith it Interſperſed, I diſregard: he doth himſelf more Hurt by them, than me: I reſolve not to be Hector'd, nor Banter'd out of my Principles, nor Scarred by Malice, or Reproach from caſting in my Mite, for the Defence of Truth, tho' he, and ſuch as he Conſpire to Overwhelm me, partly with their Books, and partly with their Calumnious Imputations. It is not uſual for Satan ſo to Rage againſt a bad Cauſe. Theſe few Pages I have written *raptim*; the Preſs waiting for them: if he, or any other will Examine them fairly, with that Candor that becometh a Chriſtian, and a Diſputant; I ſhall be willing to be Corrected, if any thing have eſcaped my Pen; if he or they write in the ſame Strain of this Preface, I will Deſpiſe them, as alſo will all Sober and Intelligent Readers.

FINIS.